



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

1,309,722

SOCIAL
WORK

11
51
069

MICH. CHILDREN'S INSTITUTE
ANN ARBOR



CONFERENCE ON THE CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN
CALLED BY PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT

JANUARY 25TH AND 26TH, 1909

WASHINGTON, D. C.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
CONFERENCE ON THE CARE
OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

HELD AT WASHINGTON, D. C.
JANUARY 25, 26, 1909

SPECIAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES
RECOMMENDING LEGISLATION DESIRED BY THE CONFER-
ENCE ON THE CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN, HELD
JANUARY 25 AND 26, 1909, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., AND
TRANSMITTING THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE

COMMUNICATED TO THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS
ON FEBRUARY 15, 1909: SECOND SESSION
OF THE SIXTIETH CONGRESS



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1909

Social ~~Science~~ Work
Library

HV

741

.A51

1909

100. ^{Work}
248
Nuch. Children's
Institute
2-13-56

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

| | Page. |
|--|---------|
| 1. President's message to Congress..... | 5-8 |
| 2. Conclusions of the conference..... | 8-14 |
| 3. Invitation sent by the President for the conference..... | 15 |
| 4. Propositions suggested for consideration..... | 16 |
| 5. Request for President to call conference..... | 17-18 |
| 6. Appointment of committee on arrangements..... | 19 |
| 7. List of persons invited to the conference..... | 20-31 |
| 8. Officers and committees..... | 32 |
| 9. Proceedings of the conference..... | 33-223 |
| A.—Session Monday afternoon at White House..... | 35-82 |
| B.—Session Monday evening at New Willard..... | 83-117 |
| C.—Session Tuesday morning at District building..... | 118-165 |
| D.—Session Tuesday afternoon at District building..... | 165-199 |
| E.—Final session and banquet, Tuesday evening, at New Willard..... | 200-223 |
| 10. Action taken by President in matter of permanent organization..... | 224 |
| 11. Letter sent by President to governors of States and Territories..... | 224 |
| 12. Index..... | 225 |



SPECIAL MESSAGE.

To the Senate and House of Representatives :

On January 25-26, 1909, there assembled in this city, on my invitation, a conference on the care of dependent children. To this conference there came from nearly every State in the Union men and women actively engaged in the care of dependent children, and they represented all the leading religious bodies.

The subject considered is one of high importance to the well-being of the nation. The Census Bureau reported in 1904 that there were in orphanages and children's homes about 93,000 dependent children. There are probably 50,000 more (the precise number never having been ascertained) in private homes, either on board or in adopted homes provided by the generosity of foster parents. In addition to these there were 25,000 children in institutions for juvenile delinquents.

Each of these children represents either a potential addition to the productive capacity and the enlightened citizenship of the nation, or, if allowed to suffer from neglect, a potential addition to the destructive forces of the community. The ranks of criminals and other enemies of society are recruited in an altogether undue proportion from children bereft of their natural homes and left without sufficient care.

The interests of the nation are involved in the welfare of this army of children no less than in our great material affairs.

Notwithstanding a wide diversity of views and methods represented in the conference, and notwithstanding the varying legislative enactments and policies of the States from which the members came, the conference, at the close of its sessions, unanimously adopted a series of declarations expressing the conclusions which they had reached. These constitute a wise, constructive, and progressive programme of child-caring work. If given full effect by the proper agencies, existing methods and practices in almost every community would be profoundly and advantageously modified.

More significant even than the contents of the declarations is the fact that they were adopted without dissenting vote and with every demonstration of hearty approval on the part of all present. They constitute a standard of accepted opinion by which each community should measure the adequacy of its existing methods and to which each community should seek to conform its legislation and its practice.

The keynote of the conference was expressed in these words:

Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. Children should not be deprived of it except for urgent and compelling reasons.

Surely poverty alone should not disrupt the home. Parents of good character suffering from temporary misfortune, and above all deserving mothers fairly well able to work but deprived of the support of the normal breadwinner, should be given such aid as may be

necessary to enable them to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of their children. The widowed or deserted mother, if a good woman, willing to work and to do her best, should ordinarily be helped in such fashion as will enable her to bring up her children herself in their natural home. Children from unfit homes, and children who have no homes, who must be cared for by charitable agencies, should, so far as practicable, be cared for in families.

I transmit herewith for your information a copy of the conclusions reached by the conference, of which the following is a brief summary:

1. *Home care.*—Children of worthy parents or deserving mothers should, as a rule, be kept with their parents at home.

2. *Preventive work.*—The effort should be made to eradicate causes of dependency, such as disease and accident, and to substitute compensation and insurance for relief.

3. *Home finding.*—Homeless and neglected children, if normal, should be cared for in families, when practicable.

4. *Cottage system.*—Institutions should be on the cottage plan with small units, as far as possible.

5. *Incorporation.*—Agencies caring for dependent children should be incorporated, on approval of a suitable state board.

6. *State inspection.*—The State should inspect the work of all agencies which care for dependent children.

7. *Inspection of educational work.*—Educational work of institutions and agencies caring for dependent children should be supervised by state educational authorities.

8. *Facts and records.*—Complete histories of dependent children and their parents, based upon personal investigation and supervision, should be recorded for guidance of child-caring agencies.

9. *Physical care.*—Every needy child should receive the best medical and surgical attention, and be instructed in health and hygiene.

10. *Cooperation.*—Local child-caring agencies should cooperate and establish joint bureaus of information.

11. *Undesirable legislation.*—Prohibitive legislation against transfer of dependent children between States should be repealed.

12. *Permanent organization.*—A permanent organization for work along the lines of these resolutions is desirable.

13. *Federal children's bureau.*—Establishment of a federal children's bureau is desirable, and enactment of pending bill is earnestly recommended.

14. Suggests special message to Congress favoring federal children's bureau and other legislation applying above principles to District of Columbia and other federal territory.

While it is recognized that these conclusions can be given their fullest effect only by the action of the several States or communities concerned, or of their charitable agencies, the conference requested me, in section 14 of the conclusions, to send to you a message recommending federal action.

There are pending in both Houses of Congress bills for the establishment of a children's bureau, i. e., Senate bill No. 8323 and House bill No. 24148. These provide for a children's bureau in the Department of the Interior, which

shall investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and shall especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, the birth rate, physical degeneracy, orphanage, juvenile delinquency and juvenile courts, desertion and illegitimacy, dangerous occupations, accidents and diseases of children of the working classes, employment, legislation affecting children in the several States and Territories, and such other facts as have a bearing upon the health, efficiency, character, and training of children.

One of the needs felt most acutely by the conference was that of accurate information concerning these questions relating to childhood. The National Government not only has the unquestioned right of research in such vital matters, but is the only agency which can effectively conduct such general inquiries as are needed for the

benefit of all our citizens. In accordance with the unanimous request of the conference, I therefore most heartily urge your favorable action on these measures.

It is not only discreditable to us as a people that there is now no recognized and authoritative source of information upon these subjects relating to child life, but in the absence of such information as should be supplied by the Federal Government many abuses have gone unchecked; for public sentiment, with its great corrective power, can only be aroused by full knowledge of the facts. In addition to such information as the Census Bureau and other existing agencies of the Federal Government already provide, there remains much to be ascertained through lines of research not now authorized by law; and there should be correlation and dissemination of the knowledge obtained without any duplication of effort or interference with what is already being done. There are few things more vital to the welfare of the nation than accurate and dependable knowledge of the best methods of dealing with children, especially with those who are in one way or another handicapped by misfortune; and in the absence of such knowledge each community is left to work out its own problem without being able to learn of and profit by the success or failure of other communities along the same lines of endeavor. The bills for the establishment of the children's bureau are advocated not only by this conference, but by a large number of national organizations that are disinterestedly working for the welfare of children, and also by philanthropic, educational, and religious bodies in all parts of the country.

I further urge that such legislation be enacted as may be necessary in order to bring the laws and practices in regard to the care of dependent children in all federal territory into harmony with the other conclusions reached by the conference.

LEGISLATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Congress took a step in the direction of the conclusions of this conference in 1893, when, on the recommendation of the late Amos G. Warner, then superintendent of charities for the District of Columbia, the Board of Children's Guardians was created, with authority, among other things, to place children in family homes. That board has made commendable progress, and its work should be strengthened and extended.

I recommend legislation for the District of Columbia in accordance with the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth sections of the conclusions of the conference, as follows:

1. That the approval of the Board of Charities be required for the incorporation of all child-caring agencies, as well as amendments of the charter of any benevolent corporation which includes child-caring work, and that other than duly incorporated agencies be forbidden to engage in the care of needy children. This legislation is needed in order to insure the fitness and responsibility of those who propose to undertake the care of helpless children. Such laws have long been in satisfactory operation in several of the larger States of the Union.

2. That the Board of Charities, through its duly authorized agents, shall inspect the work of all agencies which care for dependant

children, whether by institutional or by home-finding methods, and whether supported by public or private funds. The state has always jealously guarded the interests of children whose parents have been able to leave them property by requiring the appointment of a guardian, under bond, accountable directly to the courts, even though there be a competent surviving parent. Surely the interests of the child who is not only an orphan but penniless ought to be no less sacred than those of the more fortunate orphan who inherits property. If the protection of the Government is necessary in the one case, it is even more necessary in the other. If we are to require that only incorporated institutions shall be allowed to engage in this responsible work, it is necessary to provide for public inspection, lest the state should become the unconscious partner of those who either from ignorance or inefficiency are unsuited to deal with the problem.

3. That the education of children in orphan asylums and other similar institutions in the District of Columbia be under the supervision of the board of education, in order that these children may enjoy educational advantages equal to those of the other children. Normal school life comes next to normal home life in the process of securing the fullest development of the child.

4. That all agencies engaged in child-caring work in the District of Columbia be required by law to adopt adequate methods of investigation and make permanent records relative to children under their care, and to exercise faithful personal supervision over their wards until legally adopted or otherwise clearly beyond the need of further supervision; the forms and methods of such investigation, records, and supervision to be prescribed and enforced by the Board of Charities.

I deem such legislation as is herein recommended not only important for the welfare of the children immediately concerned, but important as setting an example of a high standard of child protection by the National Government to the several States of the Union, which should be able to look to the nation for leadership in such matters.

I herewith transmit a copy of the full text of the proceedings.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 1909.*

APPENDIX A.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, EMBODYING THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE ON THE CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN HELD BY INVITATION OF THE PRESIDENT IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 25 AND 26, 1909.

SYLLABI OF CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS.

1. *Home care.*—Children of worthy parents or deserving mothers should, as a rule, be kept with their parents at home.
2. *Preventive work.*—Society should endeavor to eradicate causes of dependency like disease and to substitute compensation and insurance for relief.
3. *Home finding.*—Homeless and neglected children, if normal, should be cared for in families, when practicable.
4. *Cottage system.*—Institutions should be on the cottage plan with small units, as far as possible.
5. *Incorporation.*—Agencies caring for dependent children should be incorporated, on approval of a suitable state board.

6. *State inspection.*—The State should inspect the work of all agencies which care for dependent children.
7. *Inspection of educational work.*—Educational work of institutions and agencies caring for dependent children should be supervised by state educational authorities.
8. *Facts and records.*—Complete histories of dependent children and their parents should be recorded for guidance of child-caring agencies.
9. *Physical care.*—Every needy child should receive the best medical and surgical attention, and be instructed in health and hygiene.
10. *Cooperation.*—Local child-caring agencies should cooperate and establish joint bureaus of information.
11. *Undesirable legislation.*—Prohibitive legislation against transfer of dependent children between States should be repealed.
12. *Permanent organization.*—A permanent organization for work along the lines of these resolutions is desirable.
13. *Federal children's bureau.*—Establishment of a federal children's bureau is desirable, and enactment of pending bill is earnestly recommended.
14. *Suggests special message to Congress* favoring federal children's bureau and other legislation applying above principles to District of Columbia and other federal territory.

HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,

President of the United States.

SIR: Having been invited by you to participate in a conference on the care of dependent children, held at Washington, D. C., January 25-26, 1909, and having considered at the sessions of such conference the various phases of the subject as stated in the memorandum accompanying your letter of invitation, and such others as have been brought before us by the executive committee, we desire to express the very great satisfaction felt by each member of this conference in the deep interest you have taken in the well-being of dependent children. The proper care of destitute children has indeed an important bearing upon the welfare of the nation. We now know so little about them as not even to know their number, but we know that there are in institutions about 93,000, and that many additional thousands are in foster or boarding homes. As a step, therefore, in the conservation of the productive capacity of the people, and the preservation of high standards of citizenship, and also because each of these children is entitled to receive humane treatment, adequate care, and proper education, your action in calling this conference, and your participation in its opening and closing sessions, will have, we believe, a profound effect upon the well-being of many thousands of children, and upon the nation as a whole.

Concerning the particular objects to which you called attention in the invitation to this conference, and the additional subjects brought before us by the executive committee, our conclusions are as follows:

HOME CARE.

1. Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. It is the great molding force of mind and of character. Children should not be deprived of it except for urgent and compelling reasons. Children of parents of worthy character, suffering from temporary misfortune and children of reasonably efficient and deserving mothers who are without the support of the normal breadwinner, should, as a rule, be kept with their parents, such aid being given as may be necessary to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children.

This aid should be given by such methods and from such sources as may be determined by the general relief policy of each community, preferably in the form of private charity, rather than of public relief. Except in unusual circumstances, the home should not be broken up for reasons of poverty, but only for considerations of inefficiency or immorality.

PREVENTIVE WORK.

2. The most important and valuable philanthropic work is not the curative, but the preventive; to check dependency by a thorough study of its causes and by effectively remedying or eradicating them should be the constant aim of society. Along these lines we urge upon all friends of children the promotion of effective measures, including legislation, to prevent blindness; to check tuberculosis and other diseases in dwellings and work places, and injuries in hazardous occupations; to secure compensation or insurance so as to provide a family income in case of sickness, accident, death, or invalidism of the breadwinner; to promote child-labor reforms, and, generally, to improve the conditions surrounding child life. To secure these ends we urge efficient cooperation with all other agencies for social betterment.

HOME FINDING.

3. As to the children who for sufficient reasons must be removed from their own homes, or who have no homes, it is desirable that, if normal in mind and body and not requiring special training, they should be cared for in families whenever practicable. The carefully selected foster home is for the normal child the best substitute for the natural home. Such homes should be selected by a most careful process of investigation, carried on by skilled agents through personal investigation and with due regard to the religious faith of the child. After children are placed in homes, adequate visitation, with careful consideration of the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual training and development of each child on the part of the responsible home-finding agency is essential.

It is recognized that for many children foster homes without payment for board are not practicable immediately after the children become dependent and that for children requiring temporary care only the free home is not available. For the temporary, or more or less permanent, care of such children different methods are in use, notably the plan of placing them in families, paying for their board, and the plan of institutional care. Contact with family life is preferable for these children, as well as for other normal children. It is necessary, however, that a large number of carefully selected boarding homes be found if these children are to be cared for in families. The extent to which such families can be found should be ascertained by careful inquiry and experiment in each locality. Unless and until such homes are found, the use of institutions is necessary.

COTTAGE SYSTEM.

4. So far as it may be found necessary temporarily or permanently to care for certain classes of children in institutions, these institutions should be conducted on the cottage plan, in order that routine

and impersonal care may not unduly suppress individuality and initiative. The cottage unit should not be larger than will permit effective personal relations between the adult caretaker or caretakers of each cottage and each child therein. Twenty-five is suggested as a desirable cottage unit, subject to revision in the light of further experience in the management of cottage institutions. The cottage plan is probably somewhat more expensive, both in construction and in maintenance, than the congregate system. It is so, however, only because it secures for the children a larger degree of association with adults and a nearer approach to the conditions of family life, which are required for the proper molding of childhood. These results more than justify the increased outlay and are truly economical. Child-caring agencies, whether supported by public or private funds, should by all legitimate means press for adequate financial support. Inferior methods should never be accepted by reason of lack of funds without continuing protest. Cheap care of children is ultimately enormously expensive, and is unworthy of a strong community. Existing congregate institutions should so classify their inmates and segregate them into groups as to secure as many of the benefits of the cottage system as possible, and should look forward to the adoption of the cottage type when new buildings are constructed.

The sending of children of any age or class to almshouses is an unqualified evil, and should be forbidden everywhere by law, with suitable penalty for its violation.

INCORPORATION.

5. To engage in the work of caring for needy children is to assume a most serious responsibility, and should, therefore, be permitted only to those who are definitely organized for the purpose, who are of suitable character, and possess, or have reasonable assurance of securing, the funds needed for their support. The only practicable plan of securing this end is to require the approval, by a state board of charities or other body exercising similar powers, of the incorporation of all child-caring agencies, including the approval of any amendments of the charter of a benevolent corporation, if it is to include child-caring work; and by forbidding other than duly incorporated agencies to engage in the care of needy children.

STATE INSPECTION.

6. The proper training of destitute children being essential to the well-being of the State, it is a sound public policy that the State, through its duly authorized representative, should inspect the work of all agencies which care for dependent children, whether by institutional or by home-finding methods, and whether supported by public or private funds. Such inspection should be made by trained agents, should be thorough, and the results thereof should be reported to the responsible authorities of the institution or agency concerned. The information so secured should be confidential, not to be disclosed except by competent authority.

INSPECTION OF EDUCATIONAL WORK.

7. Destitute children at best labor under many disadvantages, and are deprived in greater or less degree of the assistance and guidance which parents afford their own children. It is important, therefore, that such children be given an education which will fit them for self-support and for the duties of citizenship, and the State should provide therefor. In order that this education may be equal to that afforded by the schools attended by the other children of the community, it is desirable that the education of children in orphan asylums and other similar institutions or placed in families should be under the supervision of the educational authorities of the State.

FACTS AND RECORDS.

8. The proper care of a child in the custody of a child-caring agency, as well as the wise decision as to the period of his retention and ultimate disposition to be made of him, involve a knowledge of the character and circumstances of his parents, or surviving parent, and near relatives, both before and at the time the child becomes dependent, and subsequently. One unfortunate feature of child-caring work hitherto is the scanty information available as to the actual careers of children who have been reared under the care of charitable agencies. This applies both to institutions which too frequently lose sight of the children soon after they leave their doors, and home-finding agencies which too frequently have failed to exercise supervision adequate to enable them to judge of the real results of their work. It is extremely desirable that, taking all precautions to prevent injury or embarrassment to those who have been the subjects of charitable care, the agencies which have been responsible for the care of children should know to what station in life they attain and what sort of citizens they become. Only in this manner can they form a correct judgment of the results of their efforts.

We believe, therefore, that every child-caring agency should—

(a) Secure full information concerning the character and circumstances of the parents and near relatives of each child in whose behalf application is made, through personal investigation by its own representative, unless adequate information is supplied by some other reliable agency.

(b) Inform itself by personal investigation at least once each year of the circumstances of the parents of children in its charge, unless the parents have been legally deprived of guardianship, and unless this information is supplied by some other responsible agency.

(c) Exercise supervision over children under their care until such children are legally adopted, are returned to their parents, attain their majority, or are clearly beyond the need of further supervision.

(d) Make a permanent record of all information thus secured.

PHYSICAL CARE.

9. The physical condition of children who become the subjects of charitable care has received inadequate consideration. Each child received into the care of such an agency should be carefully examined by a competent physician, especially for the purpose of ascer-

taining whether such peculiarities, if any, as the child presents may be due to any defect of the sense organs or to other physical defect. Both institutions and placing-out agencies should take every precaution to secure proper medical and surgical care of their children and should see that suitable instruction is given them in matters of health and hygiene.

COOPERATION.

10. Great benefit can be derived from a close cooperation between the various child-caring agencies, institutional and otherwise, in each locality. It is especially desirable that harmonious relations be established in regard to the classes of children to be received by each agency, the relations of such agencies to the parents of children received, and the subsequent oversight of children passing from the custody of child-caring agencies. The establishment of a joint bureau of investigation and information by all the child-caring agencies of each locality is highly commended, in the absence of any other suitable central agency through which they may cooperate.

UNDESIRABLE LEGISLATION.

11. We greatly deprecate the tendency of legislation in some States to place unnecessary obstacles in the way of placing children in family homes in such States by agencies whose headquarters are elsewhere, in view of the fact that we favor the care of destitute children, normal in mind and body, in families, whenever practicable.

We recognize the right of each State to protect itself from vicious, diseased, or defective children from other States by the enactment of reasonable protective legislation; but experience proves that the reception of healthy normal children is not only an act of philanthropy, but also secures a valuable increment to the population of the community and an ultimate increase of its wealth.

The people of the more prosperous and less congested districts owe a debt of hospitality to the older communities from which many of them came.

We earnestly protest, therefore, against such legislation as is prohibitive in form or in effect, and urge that where it exists it be repealed.

PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.

12. The care of dependent children is a subject about which nearly every session of the legislature of every State in the Union concerns itself; it is a work in which State and local authorities in many States are engaged, and in which private agencies are active in every State. Important decisions are being made constantly by associations, institutions, and public authorities affecting questions of policy, the type of buildings to be constructed, the establishment of an adequate system of investigating homes and visiting children placed in homes, and scores of important matters affecting the well-being of needy children. Each of these decisions should be made with full knowledge of the experience of other States and agencies, and of the trend of opinion among those most actively engaged in the care of children, and able to speak from wide experience and careful observation. One effective means of securing this result would be the establishment of a perma-

nent organization to undertake, in this field, work comparable to that carried on by the National Playground Association, the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, the National Child Labor Committee, and other similar organizations in their respective fields. It is our judgment that the establishment of such a permanent voluntary organization, under auspices which would insure a careful consideration of all points of view, broad mindedness and tolerance, would be desirable and helpful, if reasonably assured of adequate financial support.

FEDERAL CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

13. A bill is pending in Congress for the establishment of a federal children's bureau to collect and disseminate information affecting the welfare of children. In our judgment the establishment of such a bureau is desirable, and we earnestly recommend the enactment of the pending measure.

SUMMARY.

14. The preceding suggestions may be almost completely summarized in this—that the particular condition and needs of each destitute child should be carefully studied and that he should receive that care and treatment which his individual needs require, and which should be as nearly as possible like the life of the other children of the community.

15. We respectfully recommend that you send to Congress a message urging favorable action upon the bill for a federal children's bureau and the enactment of such legislation as will bring the laws and the public administration of the District of Columbia and other federal territory into harmony with the principles and conclusions herein stated, and we further recommend that you cause to be transmitted to the governor of each State of the Union a copy of the proceedings of this conference for the information of the state board of charities or other body exercising similar powers.

Yours very respectfully,

HASTINGS H. HART,
EDMOND J. BUTLER,
JULIAN W. MACK,
HOMER FOLKS,
JAMES E. WEST,
Committee on Resolutions.

By order of the conference.

The above letter, embodying the conclusions of the conference on the care of dependent children, was unanimously adopted at the close of the afternoon session on Tuesday, January 26, 1909.

HOMER FOLKS,
Vice-Chairman.
JAMES E. WEST,
Secretary.

CALL FOR THE CONFERENCE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 25, 1908.

I have received a letter of which I inclose a copy, together with a statement of the official positions of the persons who signed it, and a memorandum which is suggested for consideration and action if the conference which the letter suggests be held. I am confident that you will be impressed with the very great importance of the subject touched on in this letter, and the desirability that there should be the fullest discussion of the propositions, a memorandum of which I inclose.

Surely nothing ought to interest our people more than the care of the children who are destitute and neglected but not delinquent. Personally, I very earnestly believe that the best way in which to care for dependent children is in the family home. In Massachusetts many orphan asylums have been discontinued and thousands of the children who formerly have gone to the orphan asylum are now kept in private homes, either on board, with payment from public or private treasuries, or in adopted homes provided by the generosity of foster parents. Many religious bodies have within the past ten years organized effective child-placing agencies.

I am accordingly inviting a number of men and women, a list of whom I will announce, to a conference to be held in Washington January 25 and 26. The conference will open by my receiving the members at the White House January 25 at 2.30 p. m. Can you attend? Will you please communicate with Mr. James E. West, 1343 Clifton street NW., Washington, D. C.?

Sincerely, yours,

(Signed by)

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

**MEMORANDUM WHICH ACCOMPANIED THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER
GIVING THE PROPOSITIONS SUGGESTED FOR CONSIDERATION
AND ACTION OF THE CONFERENCE.**

1. Should there be established in one of the federal departments a national children's bureau, one of whose objects shall be the collection and dissemination of accurate information in regard to child-caring work and in regard to the needs of children throughout the United States?

2. Should the State inspect the work of all child-caring agencies, including both institutions and home-finding societies?

3. Should the approval of the state board of charities (or other body exercising similar powers) be necessary to the incorporation of all child-caring agencies, and to an amendment of the charter of an existing benevolent corporation, if it is to include child-caring work, and should the care of children by other than incorporated agencies be forbidden?

4. Should children of parents of worthy character, but suffering from temporary misfortune, and the children of widows of worthy character and reasonable efficiency, be kept with their parents, aid being given to the parents to enable them to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children. Should the breaking of a home be permitted for reasons of poverty, or only for reasons of inefficiency or immorality?

5. Should children normal in mind and body, and not requiring special training, who must be removed from their own homes, be cared for in families, wherever practicable?

6. So far as an institution may be necessary, should they be conducted on the cottage plan, and should the cottage unit exceed 25 children?

7. Should the state educational authorities exercise supervision over the educational work of orphan asylums and kindred institutions?

8. Should child-caring agencies aim to cooperate with each other and with other agencies of social betterment for the purpose of diminishing or removing altogether the causes of orphanage, of child destitution, and child delinquency?

9. Would it be helpful and desirable if some permanent committee or organization comparable to the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, the National Child Labor Committee, etc., could be established for the purpose of carrying on an active propaganda with a view of securing better laws in relation to children, better organizations of child-caring agencies, better methods of relief and aid to children throughout the United States?

REQUEST FOR THE PRESIDENT TO CALL THE CONFERENCE.

DECEMBER 22, 1908.

HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your message to Congress December 6, 1904, urging the establishment of a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, you said:

No Christian and civilized community can afford to show a happy-go-lucky lack of concern for the youth of to-day; for, if so, the community will have to pay a terrible penalty of financial burden and social degradation in the to-morrow.

Congress promptly responded and enacted an excellent juvenile court law. The wisdom of this step has already been proven by the work of the court.

Generally speaking, the cause of the delinquent child has been well advanced. Juvenile courts have been established in many States; a considerable number of probation officers have been appointed; many of the juvenile reformatories are progressing along well established lines of modern thought and are supported by generous appropriations from the public treasury; detention homes have been opened in many cities to keep children out of jail; parental schools are being established for the training of truants and unruly school children.

The State has dealt generously with her troublesome children; but what is she doing for those who make no trouble but are simply unfortunate? There are a large number of these children for whom there is need of special activity and interest. Some are orphans or half-orphans; some are abandoned by heartless parents; some are victims of cruelty or neglect. They are not delinquents; they are accused of no fault; they are simply destitute or neglected.

Destitute children certainly deserve as much consideration and help as those who, by reason of some alleged delinquency, enforce the attention of the State and become objects of its care; but only a few States have defined responsibility for this class of children. Their care and protection is left in many localities to the fidelity of volunteer agencies without requiring proper standards of method or efficiency and without definite responsibility to the State or the community.

Unfortunately there has not been as frequent interchange of ideas and experiences among the officials of orphan asylums, with consequent progress, as among those who work for delinquents.

These dependent children are cared for in different ways. According to a special bulletin of the United States Census there were in orphan asylums and kindred institutions on December 31, 1904, not less than 92,887 children. In addition to these there were probably some 50,000 dependent children in family homes under supervision.

In many States, however, little or no child-saving work is done, and in many States the organizations are greatly handicapped by the lack of appreciation and of adequate support.

It is of the highest importance to the welfare of this vast number of future citizens that all child-saving work shall be conducted on a high plane of efficiency; that in the placing of children in families the utmost care shall be taken to exclude all undesirable applicants; that every precaution shall be taken in the subsequent supervision of the children to prevent neglect, overwork, insufficient education, or inadequate moral and religious training, and that institutions shall be so carried on as to secure the best physical, mental, moral, and religious training of each individual child and to fit it for active and creditable citizenship.

The problem of the dependent child is acute; it is large; it is national. We believe that it is worthy of national consideration. We earnestly hope, therefore, that you will cooperate in an effort to get this problem before the American people.

If a conference could be arranged, under your auspices, in Washington, some time in January, to which leaders of this particular phase of child-caring work could be invited, it would, in our judgment, greatly advance the cause of the dependent child. Such a conference could formulate a plan for your consideration, pointing out ways whereby you could specially help by recommending to Congress certain legislation and in other ways.

Hoping for your favorable consideration of this matter, we are,
Very respectfully,

HOMER FOLKS,
Secretary, New York State Charities Aid Association.

HASTINGS H. HART,
*Superintendent Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society,
Chairman, Study of Child Placing, Russell Sage Foundation.*

JOHN M. GLENN,
Secretary and Director, Russell Sage Foundation.

THOMAS M. MULRY,
President, St. Vincent de Paul Society of the United States.

EDWARD T. DEVINE,
*Editor Charities and The Commons,
General Secretary, Charity Organizing Society,
Professor of Social Economy, Columbia University.*

JULIAN W. MAOK,
*Judge Circuit Court, of Chicago, Ill.,
Ex-President, National Conference of Jewish Charities.*

CHARLES W. BIRTWELL,
General Secretary, Boston Children's Aid Society.

THEODORE DREISER,
Editor of the Delineator.

JAMES E. WEST,
Secretary, National Child-Rescue League.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS.

On January 10, 1909, the President appointed James E. West, of Washington, D. C., Homer Folks and Thomas M. Mulry, of New York City, as a committee to make all preliminary arrangements for the conference, including the selection of speakers to open the discussion of the various propositions mentioned in the memorandum accompanying his letter of invitation; to provide for the presentation of such additional propositions as in their judgment seemed wise; and also to prepare, subject to the approval of the conference, a programme and rules to govern the proceedings.

PERSONS WHO WERE INVITED TO THE CONFERENCE.

- ADDAMS, Hon. GEORGE S.**, Cleveland, Ohio.
Judge Juvenile Court.
- ADDAMS, Miss JANE, LL. D.**, Chicago, Ill.
President, Hull House.
- AHERN, WILLIAM J.**, Concord, N. H.
Secretary State Board of Charities and Correction.
- AMAND, BERNARD C.**, 120 East Nineteenth street, New York City.
- ATKINSON, Judge GEORGE W.**, United States Court of Claims.
President West Virginia Children's Home Society.
- BALL, WILLIAM C.**, 1138 South Fifth street, Terre Haute, Ind.
Member Board of Control, Indiana Reform School for Boys.
- BARNABAS, Rev. Brother F. S. C.**, 417 Broome street, New York City.
Superintendent of N. Y. C. P. Placing Out Bureau for Dependent Children.
Superintendent of Somer Agricultural School for Dependent Children.
Director of St. Philip's Home for Friendless Working Boys.
Member of N. Y. State Conference Committee on Dependent Children.
- BARRETT, Mrs. KATE WALLER**, Alexandria, Va.
General Superintendent, National Florence Crittenton Mission.
- BASSFORD, Dr. S. J.**, Biddeford, Me.
President York County Children's Aid Society.
- BERNSTEIN, LUDWIG B., Ph. D.**, One hundred and fiftieth street and Broadway, New York City.
Superintendent Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Orphan Asylum.
- BICKNELL, ERNEST P.**, War Department, Washington, D. C.
President National Conference of Charities and Correction.
Secretary National Red Cross Society.
Formerly:
General Superintendent Chicago Bureau of Charities.
Secretary Board of State Charities of Indiana.
- BIGGS, ROBERT**, Law Building, Baltimore, Md.
President St. Vincent de Paul Society.
- BINGHAM, Hon. ROBERT W.**, Louisville, Ky.
President Kentucky Children's Home Society.
President Board of Children's Guardians for Louisville and Jefferson County.
Formerly:
Mayor of the City of Louisville.
- BIRTWELL, CHARLES W.**, 43 Hawkins street, Boston, Mass.
General Secretary Boston Children's Aid Society.
- BLACK, Hon. SAMUEL L.**, Columbus, Ohio.
Judge of the Juvenile Court.
- BOWEN, Mrs. JOSEPH TILTON**, Chicago, Ill.
President Juvenile Court Committee.
- BRACE, CHARLES LORING**, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York City.
Secretary New York Children's Aid Society.
- BRAUCHER, H. S.**, City Building, Portland, Me.
General Secretary Associated Charities.
- BROWN, Dr. ELMER ELLSWORTH**, Washington, D. C.
United States Commissioner of Education.
- BROWN, JULIUS A.**, 2317 West Ninth street, Los Angeles, Cal.
President California Children's Home Society.
- BUCK, WILLIAM B.**, 1506 Arch street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Secretary Children's Bureau.
Superintendent Seybert Institution.
Formerly:
Secretary Cuban Orphan Society, New York.
Secretary New York County Committee, State Charities Aid Association.
Superintendent of Inspection, New York State Board of Charities.

- BURNETT, Hon. JOHN M.**, 2022 Sutter street, San Francisco, Cal.
 President Particular Council of San Francisco, Society of St. Vincent de Paul.
- BUSH, THOMAS G.**, Birmingham, Ala.
- BUTLER, AMOS W.**, State House, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Secretary State Board of Charities.
 Formerly:
 Chairman Committee on Children, National Conference of Charities and Correction.
 President National Conference of Charities and Correction.
 Chairman Section on Anthropology, American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- BUTLER, EDWARD B.**, 3408 Michigan avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 President of the Board of Directors of the Illinois Manual Training School Farm.
- BUTLER, EDMOND J.**, 44 East Twenty-third street, New York City.
 Tenement House Commissioner.
 Corresponding Secretary Superior Council of New York, Society of St. Vincent de Paul.
 Vice-President Particular Council of New York, Society of St. Vincent de Paul.
 Director Ozanam Association of City of New York.
 Formerly:
 Director and Member of Executive Committee of the Catholic Home Bureau of New York.
 Member of Committee on Dependent Children, Charity Organization Society of New York.
- CARNEGIE, ANDREW**, New York City.
- CARROLL, RICHARD**, Columbia, S. C.
 Manager South Carolina Industrial Home for Destitute and Dependent Colored Children.
- CARSTENS, C. C.**, Boston, Mass.
 Secretary Massachusetts Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children.
- CLARK, A. W.**, Omaha, Nebr.
 Superintendent Child Saving Institute of Omaha.
 Formerly:
 Superintendent Boys' and Girls' Aid Society of Omaha.
 General Secretary Associated Charities of Omaha.
 Member Nebraska State Board of Charities.
 Member Nebraska Child Labor Committee.
 President Sociological Club of Omaha.
- CLARK, Dr. WM. BULLOCK**, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 President Children's Aid Society of Baltimore.
- CONOVER, Hon. ALLEN B.**, Madison, Wis.
 Member Wisconsin State Board of Control.
- CORCORAN, Rev. JOHN F.**, New Haven, Conn.
 St. Francis Orphan Asylum.
- CRANE, RICHARD**, Ingalls Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Secretary Particular Council St. Vincent de Paul Society of Cincinnati.
 President St. Xavier Conference, St. Vincent de Paul Society of Cincinnati.
 Treasurer St. Xavier Parochial School, of Cincinnati.
 Trustee St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum of Cincinnati.
- CROUSE, MEIGS V.**, 312 West Ninth street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Superintendent Cincinnati Children's Home.
- CURTIS, Miss FRANCES GREELY**, 28 Mount Vernon street, Boston, Mass.
 Member Massachusetts State Board of Charities and Chairman Committee on Minor Wards.
- CUSHING, O. K.**, 37 Seventh street, San Francisco, Cal.
 State Board of Charities.
- DE FOREST, ROBERT W.**, 30 Broad street, New York City.
 President New York Charity Organization Society.
 Vice-President Russell Sage Foundation.
 Formerly:
 President National Conference of Charities and Correction.
- DE LACY, Hon. WM. H.**, 1816 F street NW., Washington, D. C.
 Judge of the Juvenile Court.
 Director St. Joseph's Male Orphan Asylum.
 Vice-President Southeast Boys' Club.
 President Society of St. Vincent de Paul for the District of Columbia.
- DESMOND, C. C.**, Spring and Third streets, Los Angeles, Cal.
 President Particular Council of Los Angeles, Society of St. Vincent de Paul.

- DEVINE, Dr. EDWARD T.**, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York City.
 Editor Charities and The Commons.
 General Secretary Charity Organization Society.
 Professor of Social Economy, Columbia University.
 Formerly:
 President National Conference of Charities and Correction.
- DILLARD, JAMES HARDY**, 571 Audubon street, New Orleans, La.
 President Jeanes Foundation. (Headquarters in New Orleans.)
 Member of Board of Home for Destitute Boys, New Orleans.
 Member of Board of the New Orleans Free Kindergarten Association.
 Formerly:
 Dean of Tulane University, New Orleans.
- DOYLE, JOHN A.**, 624 West St. Catherine street, Louisville, Ky.
- DOYLE, MICHAEL FRANCIS**, 1731 South Eighteenth street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Vice-President Particular Council of Philadelphia Society St. Vincent de Paul.
- DREISER, THEODORE**, Spring and Macdougall streets, New York City.
 Editor of the Delineator.
- DYSART, Rev. J. P.**, Loan and Trust Building, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Superintendent The Children's Home Society of Wisconsin.
- EDSON, JOHN JOY**, Ninth and F streets, NW., Washington, D. C.
 President of the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia.
 Member of the President's Special Commission on Penal and Reformatory Institutions in the District of Columbia.
 Treasurer of the Associated Charities.
- EINSTEIN, Mrs. WILLIAM**, 121 East Fifty-seventh street, New York City.
 President Federation of Sisterhoods.
 President Emanuel Sisterhood.
 Vice-President United Hebrew Charities.
 Formerly:
 Member Committee on Dependent Children, Charity Organization Society.
- EISSFELDT, Rev. C.**, Wauwatosa, Wis.
 General Superintendent Lutheran Kinderfreund Societies.
- EMMERT, Prof. DAVID**, Huntingdon, Pa.
 General Secretary Home for Orphan and Friendless Children.
 Study of Child Placing, Russell Sage Foundation, Central Pennsylvania.
- FALCONER, Mrs. MARTHA P.**, 900 North Twenty-second street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Superintendent Girls' House of Refuge.
 Formerly:
 Assistant Superintendent, Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, Chicago.
 Probation Officer Juvenile Court, Chicago.
- FRAGIN, Hon. N. B.**, Birmingham, Ala.
 Judge of the Inferior Criminal Court.
 Member of the National Child Labor Committee.
- FEE, JAMES E.**, State House, Boston, Mass.
 Superintendent Division of Minor Wards, State Board of Charities.
 Member of St. Vincent de Paul Society.
- FELTON, Miss KATHERINE C.**, 628 Montgomery street, San Francisco, Cal.
 General Secretary Associated Charities.
- FIELD, PARKER B.**, 277 Tremont street, Boston, Mass.
 Superintendent Boston Children's Mission to the Children of the Destitute.
 Superintendent of Barnard Memorial (a work with children).
 Superintendent of Boston Floating Hospital (for infants).
 Assistant at Boston Children's Aid Society.
 Formerly:
 Executive Agent of Pauper Institutions Trustees of Boston.
- FITZPATRICK, Rev. MALLICK J.**, 357 Lafayette street, New York City.
 Rector Mission of Immaculate Virgin.
 Vice-President and Trustee of the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin.
- FLEISHER, SAMUEL S.**, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Director Jewish Orphan Asylum.
 Trustee Baron de Hirsch Fund of America.
 Vice-President Juvenile Protective Association, Philadelphia.
 Director National Conference of Jewish Charities.
 Director Jewish Foster Home and Orphan Asylum, Philadelphia.
 Chairman Baron de Hirsch Agricultural School, Woodbine, N. J.
 Trustee Young Women's Union, Philadelphia.
 Founder and Sole Director Graphic Sketch Club, Philadelphia (free art school and club house).

- FLEXNER, BERNARD**, Louisville, Ky.
 Chairman Juvenile Court Board, Louisville.
 Treasurer International Juvenile Court Society.
- FOLKS, HOMER**, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York City.
 Secretary State Charities Aid Association.
 President State Probation Commission.
 Vice-Chairman National Child Labor Committee.
 Formerly:
 Commissioner of Charities of New York City.
- FOX, HUGH F.**, Plainfield, N. J.
 President State Board of Children's Guardians.
 Editor New Jersey Review of Charities and Corrections.
 Formerly:
 President New Jersey Children's Protective Alliance.
 Member of the National Child Labor Committee.
- FOY, Rev. FRANCIS A.**, East Nutley, N. J.
 Executive Chairman The Catholic Children's Aid Association of New Jersey.
 Supervisor of Charities for the Catholic Diocese of Newark.
 Secretary New Jersey State Charities Aid Association.
- FRANK, HENRY L.**, 90 Washington street, Chicago, Ill.
 President Jewish Orphan Society.
- FRANKEL, LEE K.**, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York City.
 Russell Sage Foundation.
 Formerly:
 Manager United Hebrew Charities of New York.
 Secretary Joint Committee on Jewish Dependent Children, New York.
- FRIEDMAN, Dr. WILLIAM S.**, Denver, Colo.
 Rabbi of Temple Emanuel, Denver.
 President State Board of Charities.
 Founder National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives.
 Vice-President Colorado State Conference of Charities.
 Formerly:
 Vice-President Charity Organization Society of Denver.
- FRISBY, Dr. ALMAH J.**, 661 Jackson street, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Member State Board of Control of Reformatory, Charitable, and Penal Institutions.
- FRISSELL, Dr. H. B.**, Hampton, Va.
 Principal of Hampton Institute.
- GANNON, RICHARD C.**, 52 Throop street, Chicago, Ill.
 President Central Council of Chicago, Society St. Vincent de Paul.
- GARDNER, Hon. WASHINGTON**, House of Representatives.
 Member of Congress from Michigan.
 President Michigan Children's Home Society.
- GARDNER, W. T.**, Station C, Portland, Oreg.
 Superintendent Boys' and Girls' Aid Society of Oregon.
- GAVISK, Rev. FRANCIS H.**, 126 Georgia street, West Indianapolis, Ind.
 Member State Board of Charities.
- GLENN, Mrs. JOHN M.**, 152 East Thirty-Fifth street, New York City.
 Formerly:
 Secretary of the Charity Organization Society of Baltimore, Md.
- GLENN, JOHN M.**, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York City.
 Secretary and Director Russell Sage Foundation.
 Formerly:
 President Supervisors of City Charities, Baltimore, Md.
 Member Child Labor Committee of Maryland.
 President National Conference of Charities and Correction.
- GONNER, LAWRENCE**, Dubuque, Iowa.
 President Particular Council of Dubuque, Society St. Vincent de Paul.
- GORDON, Miss JEAN M.**, 1800 Prytania street, New Orleans, La.
 Factory Inspector of New Orleans.
- GRASTY, NATHANIEL G.**, City Hall, Baltimore, Md.
 Secretary Supervisors of City Charities.
 Director House of Reformation for Colored Boys.
 S. S. Superintendent Maryland School for Boys.
 Visitor to Female House of Refuge.
 General Director National Junior Republic.
- GRAVES, WILLIAM C.**, Springfield, Ill.
 Executive Secretary Board State Commissioners of Public Charities.
- GRIFFIN, FRANCIS B.**, 161 West Sixty-first street, New York City.
 Treasurer New York Infant Asylum.

- GRISWOLD, Miss JOSEPHINE M.**, 60 Brown-Tomson Building, Hartford, Conn.
Secretary Connecticut Children's Aid Society.
- HALL, EDWARD A.**, 66 Spring street, Springfield, Mass.
President Central Council St. Vincent de Paul Society of Springfield.
Probation Officer for Superior Court of Massachusetts.
Director Boys' Club, Springfield.
Director Playground Association.
- HALL, FRANK D.**, Tenth street and Eighth avenue south, Fargo, N. Dak.
Superintendent Children's Home Society.
- HART, Mrs. HARRY**, 4639 Drexel Building, Chicago, Ill.
Juvenile Court Committee.
- HART, HASTINGS H., LL. D.**, 79 Dearborn street, Chicago, Ill.
Superintendent Children's Home and Aid Society of Illinois.
Chairman Study of Child Placing for Russell Sage Foundation.
Secretary National Children's Home Society.
Formerly:
Secretary Minnesota State Board of Corrections and Charities.
General Secretary National Conference of Charities and Correction.
President National Conference of Charities and Correction.
- HATHAWAY, SEYMOUR J.**, Marietta, Ohio.
Trustee Children's Home.
Formerly:
President Ohio Children's Home Convention.
Chairman Committee for Revising Laws Relating to Children's Homes in Ohio.
- HAYNES, SUMNER W.**, 152 East Market street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Superintendent Indiana Children's Home Society.
- HEBERD, ROBERT W.**, foot East Twenty-sixth street, New York City.
Commissioner of Public Charities.
Formerly:
Secretary of the State Board of Charities of New York.
Superintendent of the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York.
- HENDERSON, Prof. CHARLES RICHMOND, Ph.D.**, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Professor of Sociology University of Chicago.
President National Children's Home Society.
Formerly:
President National Conference of Charities and Correction.
- HERRICK, Hon. MYRON T.**, Cleveland, Ohio.
Ex-Governor of Ohio.
- HEYMANN, MICHEL**, 1321 Valence street, New Orleans, La.
Former Superintendent Jewish Orphan Home.
- HILLES, CHARLES D.**, Chauncey, New York.
Superintendent New York Juvenile Asylum.
Formerly:
Superintendent The Boys' Industrial School of Ohio.
Secretary National Conference on the Education of Backward, Truant, and Delinquent Children.
- HIRSCH, Rabbi EML G., D. D.**, Chicago, Ill.
Rabbi Chicago Linai Congregation.
Member of the Board of Commissioners of Charities of Illinois.
Vice-President Jewish Home Finding Society of Chicago.
- HOLLANDER, JACOB H.**, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Professor of Political Economy.
- HUNT, Rev. WALTER REID**, 124 Essex avenue, Orange, N. J.
President Children's Aid and Protective Society of the Oranges.
Director State Conference of Charities and Correction.
Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Orange.
Formerly:
Secretary of the State Conference of Charities and Correction and Chairman of the Orange Conference of Charities and Correction.
- HURLEY, TIMOTHY D.**, Chicago, Ill.
President Visitation and Aid Society.
- HUTTON, Prof. A. J.**, Waukesha, Wis.
Superintendent Industrial School for Boys.
- HYNES, THOMAS W.**, 327 Schermerhorn street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Deputy Commissioner of Charities, New York City.
President Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Brooklyn.
Formerly:
Commissioner of Corrections, New York City.

JACKSON, JAMES F., Cleveland, Ohio.

Superintendent Associated Charities.

Formerly:

Secretary Associated Charities, St. Paul, Minn.

Secretary Minnesota State Board of Corrections and Charities.

Assistant Secretary Charity Organization Society, New York City (Secretary Committee on Dependent Children).

Manager Minneapolis Associated Charities.

JAMISON, A. T., Greenwood, S. C.

Superintendent Connie Maxwell Orphanage.

JARRETT, Miss MARY C., Saco, Me.

General Secretary York County Children's Aid Society.

JOHNSON, ALEXANDER, Indianapolis, Ind.

Secretary National Conference Charities and Correction.

Formerly:

Superintendent School for Feeble Minded, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Secretary State Board of Charities of Indiana.

President National Conference of Charities and Correction.

JONES, GEORGE L., Baltimore, Md.

General Secretary Henry Watson Children's Aid Society.

KELLOGG, CHARLES P., Waterbury, Conn.

Secretary State Board of Charities.

KELSO, J. J., Parliament Building, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

State Superintendent Neglected and Dependent Children.

KENNEDY, JAMES F., 518 Tribune Building, Chicago, Ill.

Secretary of Central Council of Chicago.

Society of St. Vincent de Paul.

KERBY, REV. DR. WILLIAM J., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

Professor of Sociology.

Formerly:

Resident Chaplain at Fresh Air Home, Baltimore.

KINGSLEY, SHERMAN C., 51-53 La Salle street, Chicago, Ill.

General Superintendent Chicago Relief and Aid Society.

Director Children's Hospital Society, Chicago.

Chairman Executive Committee Milk Commission, Chicago.

Formerly:

Agent Boston Children's Aid Society.

General Secretary Boston Children's Friend Society.

LATHROP, Miss JULIA C., Rockford, Ill.

Member State Board of Public Charities.

LATTMORE, Miss FLORENCE LARRABEE, New York City.

Study of Institutional Children, Russell Sage Foundation.

Former connections:

Committee on Physical Welfare of School Children, New York City.

Seybert Institution for Poor Boys and Girls, Philadelphia.

The Pittsburg Survey of "Charities and Commons."

LEWIS, GEORGE A., 31 Erie County Savings Bank, Buffalo, N. Y.

Chairman Committee on Children, Charity Organization Society of Buffalo.

LEWISOHN, ADOLPH, 42 Broadway, New York City.

President Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society.

LIES, EUGENE T., Minneapolis, Minn.

General Secretary Associated Charities.

LINDLEY, DR. WALTER, 1414 South Hope street, Los Angeles, Cal.

Chairman Committee on Public Health.

LINDSAY, SAMUEL McCUNE, New York City.

Professor of Social Legislation in Columbia University.

Director of New York School of Philanthropy.

Vice Chairman National Child Labor Committee.

Formerly:

Commissioner of Education for Porto Rico.

Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee.

LINDSEY, HON. BEN. B., Denver, Colo.

Judge Juvenile Court.

LOOMIS, FRANK D., 10 Academy street, Newark, N. J.

General Secretary of Children's Bureau.

Formerly:

Special Assistant to the General Secretary of the Brooklyn Children's Aid Society.

LOVE, REV. WILLIAM DeLOSS, Ph.D., Hartford, Conn.

President Connecticut Humane Society.

- LOVEJOY, OWEN R.**, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York City.
General Secretary National Child Labor Committee.
- LOW, Miss MINNIE F.**, 4906 Indiana avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Superintendent Bureau of Personal Service.
Member of Executive Committee of several of the Local Branches of Juvenile Protective League.
Member of Executive Committee of Jewish Home Finding Society.
Organizer of Woman's Loan Association of Chicago.
- Formerly:
District Probation Officer of Juvenile Court of Cook County.
Member of Board of Directors of Juvenile Court Committee.
Member Executive Committee of Cook County Child Saving Conference.
- LOWENSTEIN, SOLOMON C.**, Amsterdam avenue and One hundred and thirty-seventh street, New York City.
Superintendent Hebrew Orphan Asylum.
- Formerly:
Head Worker Jewish Settlement, Cincinnati.
Superintendent United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati.
Assistant Manager United Hebrew Charities, New York City.
Secretary National Conference of Jewish Charities.
- MACY, V. EVERIT**, 68 Broad street, New York City.
Treasurer National Child Labor Committee.
- MACFARLAND, Mrs. H. B. F.**, The Marlborough, Washington, D. C.
Member Board of Children's Guardians.
- MACFARLAND, Hon. H. B. F.**, The Marlborough, Washington, D. C.
President Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.
- MACK, Hon. JULIAN W.**, Chicago, Ill.
Judge of Circuit Court, Cook County.
Member of Executive Committee National Conference of Jewish Charities.
Member of Executive Committee National Conference of Charities and Correction.
Member of Executive Committee Juvenile Court Committee, Cook County.
Member of Executive Committee Jewish Home Finding Society of Chicago.
Vice-President Associated Jewish Charities of Chicago.
Vice-President Jewish Orphan Society of Chicago.
President League for the Protection of Immigrants.
- Formerly:
Judge of Juvenile Court of Cook County.
President National Conference of Jewish Charities.
- MAGRUDER, J. WILLIAM**, 101 West Saratoga street, Baltimore, Md.
General Secretary of the Federated Charities.
- Formerly:
President Associated Charities, Portland, Me.
- MANN, B. PICKMAN**, District Building, Washington, D. C.
President Board of Children's Guardians.
- Formerly:
Member of Board of Managers of Associated Charities.
Secretary Board of Children's Guardians.
Vice-President Charity Organization Society of the District of Columbia.
- MARKE, MARTIN A.**, 5932 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
Chairman of the Orphans' Guardian Fund of the Improved Order of Red Men.
Chairman of the Committee on Benevolent Association of the Chamber of Commerce.
Director Jewish Orphan Asylum.
- MAYBEE, Rev. WM. J.**, 2605 East Franklin street, Richmond, Va.
Superintendent Children's Home Society of Virginia.
- MAYMON, THOMAS B.**, 20 Market Square, Providence, R. I.
General Agent and Secretary Rhode Island Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children.
- MCCARTHY, JOHN E.**, 30 Tremont street, Boston, Mass.
General Agent Children's Institutions Department, City of Boston.
- MCCARTHY, Miss THERESA E.**, San Francisco, Cal.
Agent Children's Agency.
- MCDUGALL, ARTHUR W.**, 10 Academy street, Newark, N. J.
Superintendent and Secretary Bureau of Associated Charities.
Director Children's Bureau of Newark.
Executive Secretary Charities Endowment Committee of Newark.
- Formerly:
General Secretary Orange Bureau of Associated Charities.
Director Children's Aid and Protective Society of the Oranges.

- McKENNA, Dr. CHARLES F.**, 50 Church street, New York City.
 Secretary Catholic Home Bureau.
 Member Superior Council of New York, Society of St. Vincent de Paul.
 Vice-President New York State Probation Commission.
- McKELWAY, A. J.**, 604 Century Building, Atlanta, Ga.
 Secretary for the Southern States National Child Labor Committee.
 Author of Oklahoma Compulsory Education Law, containing provision for education of children and support of dependents.
- McMAHON, Rev. WILLIAM**, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Editor Catholic Universe.
- McMAHON, Rt. Rev. Mgr. D. J.**, 237 East Twenty-first street, New York City.
 Supervisor of Catholic Charities in New York.
- MERRILL, GALEN A.**, Owatonna, Minn.
 Superintendent Minnesota State Public School for Dependent and Neglected Children.
 Formerly:
 State Agent of the Michigan State Public School for Dependent Children.
- METZ, Hon. HERMAN A.**, 280 Broadway, New York City.
 Comptroller of New York City.
- MILLS, WILLIAM H. A.**, 415 South Fifteenth street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 General Secretary Pennsylvania Society to Protect Children from Cruelty.
- MINNICK, JAMES**, 410 Warren avenue, East Providence, R. I.
 General Manager of the Providence Society for Organizing Charity.
 Formerly:
 Superintendent Stock Yards District, Chicago Bureau of Charities.
 Superintendent West Side District, Chicago Bureau of Charities.
- MITCHELL, MAX**, 43 Hawkins street, Boston, Mass.
 Superintendent Federated Jewish Charities.
- MONTGOMERY, JOHN BARRETT**, Coldwater, Mich.
 Superintendent Michigan State Public School.
- MORROW, Rev. O. S.**, Topeka, Kans.
 Superintendent Kansas Children's Home Society.
- MOSES, Hon. JACOB M.**, Court-house, Baltimore, Md.
 Judge Juvenile Court.
 President Maccabean Social Settlement.
 Director Federated Jewish Charities.
 Director United Hebrew Charities.
 Directing Counsel Legal Aid Bureau.
- MULRY, Hon. THOMAS M.**, Emigrant Savings Bank, New York City.
 President St. Vincent de Paul Society of the United States.
 Formerly:
 President of the National Conference of Charities and Correction.
- MURASKY, Judge FRANK J.**, San Francisco, Cal.
- MURPHY, DANIEL B.**, 122 East Main street, Rochester, N. Y.
 Ex-President New York Conference Charities and Correction.
 Member Board of Managers Craig Colony, Sonyea, N. Y.
- NEILL, Hon. CHARLES P.**, Ph. D., 3560 Macomb street NW., Washington, D. C.
 United States Commissioner of Labor.
 Formerly:
 Vice-President Board of Charities of the District of Columbia.
- O'BRIEN, N. W.**, 523 Jefferson street, Detroit, Mich.
 President Particular Council of Detroit, Society St. Vincent de Paul.
- O'REILLY, Miss MARY BOYLE**, Boston, Mass.
 Secretary Children's Institution Department.
 Member of Board of Prison Commissioners of Massachusetts.
- OSBORNE, THOMAS MOTT**, Auburn, N. Y.
 New York Public Service Commissioner for Second District.
 President George Junior Republic Association.
 Member of Charities Aid Association.
 Member Executive Committee New York Prison Association.
- PEAR, WILLIAM H.**, Room 32, 43 Hawkins street, Boston, Mass.
 General Agent Boston Provident Association.
 Director Society for Helping Destitute Mothers and Infants.
 Chairman Paine Fund Committee, Cambridge.
 Formerly:
 Assistant Secretary Boston Children's Aid Society.
- PECKHAM, CHARLES H.**, Providence, R. I.
 Secretary Board of State Charities.

- PETER, Hon. ARTHUR**, Louisville, Ky.
Judge Juvenile Court.
- PEQUIGNOT, Z. J.**, Philadelphia, Pa.
President Society of St. Vincent de Paul.
- PINCKNEY, Hon. M. W.**, Chicago, Ill.
Judge Juvenile Court.
- PLATT, Hon. RUTHERFORD H.**, 13 East State street, Columbus, Ohio.
Member of the Ohio Board of State Charities.
- PLEASANTS, J. HALL, M. D.**, 16 West Chase street, Baltimore, Md.
President Supervisors of City Charities.
Manager Henry Watson Children's Aid Society.
- PUTNAM, Dr. CHARLES P.**, 30 Tremont street, Boston, Mass.
Chairman of Trustees for Children.
- RAPIER, THOMAS C.**, New Orleans, La.
Manager The Picayune.
- REEDER, RUDOLPH R.**, Ph. D., Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Superintendent New York Orphanage.
Corporate Member of the Illinois Children's Home Finding Society.
- REES, THEODORE P.**, Philadelphia, Pa.
Children's Agent, Department of Public Health and Charities.
- REILLY, Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. L.**, Schenectady, N. Y.
Chairman Committee on Dependent Children, Schenectady Charities Association.
- REILLY, RICHARD M.**, 122 East King street, Lancaster, Pa.
President Particular Council of Harrisburg Society of St. Vincent de Paul.
Member Board of Directors of Lancaster Charity Society.
Secretary St. Mary's Orphan Asylum, Lancaster, Pa.
- RICE, Mrs. WILLIAM B.**, 17 West Sixteenth street, New York City.
Member Russell Sage Foundation.
Vice-President State Charities Aid Association.
Member of Executive Committee and Central Council, Charity Organization Society.
Formerly:
Chairman Committee on Children, State Charities Aid Association.
Member Committee on the Care of Motherless Infants, State Charities Aid Association.
- RIS, JACOB A.**, 524 North Beech street, New York City.
- RISING, Mrs. F. A.**, 351 West Broadway, Winona, Minn.
- ROBINSON, GEORGE B.**, 415 Broome street, New York City.
President New York Catholic Protectory.
Member of St. Vincent de Paul Society.
Member of Executive Committee of National Conference of Charities and Correction.
Formerly:
Secretary New York Catholic Protectory.
Member of Committee on Children, of National Conference of Charities and Correction, at Washington, Detroit, Portland (Oreg.), and Philadelphia.
- ROSENWALD, JULIUS**, 4901 Ellis avenue, Chicago, Ill.
President of Sears, Roebuck & Co.
President Associated Jewish Charities.
Director Jewish Home-Finding Society.
- RUEBSING, Very Rev. JOSEPH, V. F.**, West Point, Nebr.
Dean and Rector of St. Mary's Church.
Member Nebraska Child Labor Law Committee.
Manager St. Joseph's Home for the Aged and Orphans.
Formerly:
Member Nebraska State Board of Charities and Correction.
- SCANLAN, MICHAEL J.**, 51 Chambers street, New York City.
President Catholic Home Bureau for Dependent Children.
- SCHIFF, JACOB H.**, 52 William street, New York City.
Member Board of Trustees, Jewish Orphan Asylum, New York City.
- SCHOFF, Mrs. FREDERIC**, 3418 Baring avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
President National Congress of Mothers.
President Philadelphia Juvenile Court and Probation Association.
Formerly:
Manager Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity.
- SCHUYLER, Miss LOUISA L.**, 37 Madison avenue, New York City.
Vice-President State Charities Aid Association.
- SEATON, Mrs. CORA H.**, 5 Astor Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
Superintendent Florida Children's Home Society.

- SEMON, GEORGE L.**, 2116 Von Borries avenue, Louisville, Ky.
State Superintendent Kentucky Children's Home Society.
President Kentucky State Conference of Charities and Corrections.
Vice-President National Conference of Charities and Corrections.
Vice-President American Prison Association.
Secretary Board of Children's Guardians, Louisville.
Trustee Midway Orphanage for Dependent Girls, Midway, Ky.
First Assistant Secretary American Prison Congress.
- SENIOR, MAX**, Mitchell Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Ex-President National Conference Jewish Charities.
- SHAFFER, NEWTON M.**, M. D., 28 East Thirty-eighth street, New York City.
Surgeon-in Chief New York State Hospital for the Care of Crippled and Deformed Children.
Clinical Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery, Cornell University Medical College.
Formerly:
Surgeon-in-Chief New York Orthopaedic Dispensary and Hospital.
Attending Orthopaedic Surgeon, St. Luke's Hospital, New York.
- SHERARD, W. B.**, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
Superintendent National Children's Home Society.
State Superintendent South Dakota Children's Home Society.
Founder Newsboys and Bootblacks' Home, Chicago.
- SHIRER, H. H.**, Columbus, Ohio.
Secretary Ohio Board of State Charities.
- SICKELS, Mrs. LUCY M.**, Adrian, Mich.
Superintendent State Industrial Home for Girls.
- SKINNER, C. W.**, 2525 Wisconsin avenue, Washington, D. C.
Superintendent Industrial Home School of the District of Columbia.
- SLINGERLAND, Rev. W. H.**, 2340 East Ninth street, Des Moines, Iowa.
Superintendent Iowa Children's Home Society.
- SOLENBERGER, EDWIN D.**, 1506 Arch street, Philadelphia, Pa.
General Secretary Pennsylvania Children's Aid Society.
Formerly:
District Superintendent Chicago Bureau of Charities.
General Manager Associated Charities, Minneapolis, Minn.
Secretary Minnesota State Conference of Charities and Correction.
- SOWERS, Mrs. HATTIE E.**, 43 Federal street, Pittsburg, Pa.
President Children's Aid Society of Western Pennsylvania.
- SPRATLING, Dr. WILLIAM P.**, 1110 North Charles street, Baltimore, Md.
Editor Transactions of the National Association for the Study of Epilepsy.
Professor of Nervous Diseases, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Baltimore, Md.
Formerly:
Medical Superintendent of the Craig Colony for Epileptics.
- STAHMANN, Rev. C. C.**, Margaretta and Newstead avenues, St. Louis, Mo.
State Superintendent Missouri Children's Home Society.
- STERN, LOUIS**, 34 West Twenty-third street, New York City.
President Hebrew Orphan Asylum of New York.
Formerly:
Trustee Hebrew Technical School.
Trustee Educational Alliance.
- STEWART, Hon. WILLIAM R.**, 31 Nassau street, New York City.
President State Board of Charities of New York.
- STONE, SEYMOUR H.**, 48 Rutland street, Boston, Mass.
General Secretary Boston Children's Friend Society.
Secretary Massachusetts State Conference of Charities.
Formerly:
Placing-Out Agent of the Boston Children's Aid Society.
Superintendent New Jersey State Board of Children's Guardians.
Superintendent Joint Application Bureau of New York Charity Organization Society.
- STREETER, Mrs. FRANK S.**, Concord, N. H.
Chairman State Board of Charities and Corrections of New Hampshire.
First Vice-President Concord Charity Organization Society.
Secretary Concord District Nursing Association.
Trustee Church Settlement Association of New Hampshire.
Formerly:
Chairman of Committee on Dependent Children of New Hampshire State Conference of Charities and Corrections.
President Concord Charity Circle.

- STREETER, WILLIAM BEMENT, A. B.**, Greensboro, N. C.
 State Superintendent of the Children's Home Society in the Carolinas.
 Formerly:
 State Agent of Michigan State Public School for Dependent Children.
 State Agent Indiana State Board of Charities.
- TILLEY, DAVID F.**, 60 Devonshire street, Boston, Mass.
 Member State Board of Charity.
 President Particular Council, Society of St. Vincent de Paul of Boston.
- THOMPSON, Rev. W. H.**, 719 Furgeson Block, Pittsburg, Pa.
 Superintendent Children's Home Society of Pennsylvania.
- THEURSTON, HENRY W.**, Chicago, Ill.
 Chief Probation Officer Juvenile Court.
- VIRDEN, Rev. CHARLES**, Springfield, Ill.
 Agent Illinois State Board of Charities.
- VON KOCH, G. HALFRED**, of Sweden.
 Editor Sociological Review and National Charity Review.
 President Children's Aid Department of National Charity Society.
 Formerly:
 Director Parish Board of Guardians.
 Member Central Council, Charity Organization Society.
- VAN PATTEN, Hon. W. J.**, 386 Pearl street, Burlington, Vt.
 President Kurn Hattin Homes, Westminster, Vt., and Saxtoris River, Vt.
- WALD, Miss LILLIAN D.**, 265 Henry street, New York City.
 Founder and Head Worker, The Henry Street Settlement.
 Member Executive Committees of the National and the New York State Child Labor Committees.
 Member Executive Committee, New York Charity Organization Society.
 Member New York State Immigration Commission.
- WAKEMAN, ARTHUR E.**, 72 Schermerhorn street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 General Secretary Brooklyn Children's Aid Society.
 Formerly:
 Visitor Placing Out Department, Boston Children's Aid Society.
- WALSH, THOMAS F.**, Denver, Colo.
 President Colorado Humane Society.
- WASHINGTON, Dr. BOOKER T.**, Tuskegee, Ala.
 President Tuskegee Institute.
- WELLER, CHARLES F.**, Pittsburg, Pa.
 Secretary Associated Charities of Pittsburg.
 Warden Neighborhood House, Washington, D. C.
 Formerly:
 Secretary Associated Charities, Washington, D. C.
- WEST, JAMES E.**, 1343 Clifton street NW., Washington, D. C.
 Secretary National Child-Rescue League.
- WHITE, ALFRED T.**, 40 Remsen street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- WHITE, Rev. WILLIAM J., D. D.**, 98 Richards street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Supervisor of Catholic Charities of Brooklyn.
 Director of Catholic Home Bureau of New York.
- WHITEHOUSE, ROBERT TREAT**, Portland, Me.
 United States Attorney for the District of Maine.
 President Children's Protective Society, Portland.
 Chairman of Commission on Creation of State Board of Charities and Corrections.
 Attorney for the Associated Charities of Portland.
- WILDER, GEORGE W.**, Spring and Macdougall streets, New York City.
 President Butterick Publishing Company.
 President National Child-Rescue League.
- WILLIAMS, MORNAY**, 56 Maiden Lane, New York City.
 Chairman New York Child Labor Committee.
 President New York State Conference of Charities and Corrections.
 President New York Juvenile Asylum.
 Formerly:
 President National Conference on Education of Backward, Truant, and Delinquent Children.
- WILLIAMS, CLARENCE V.**, Trenton, N. J.
 Superintendent New Jersey Children's Home Society.
 Superintendent Delaware Children's Home Society.

- WILLIAMSON, Mrs. EMILY E.**, 310 North Broad street, Elizabeth, N. J.
 President New Jersey State Charities Aid and Prison Reform Association.
 Chairman Executive Committee and Treasurer New Jersey State Board of Children's Guardians, and Probation Officer of Union County.
 Member of State Committee on Child Labor.
 Member Executive Committee New Jersey Children's Alliance.
 Secretary Board of Managers of State Institution for Feeble-Minded Women and Girls.
 Formerly:
 Commissioner on Dependent Children.
 Member of Commission on Dependency and Crime.
- WILLIS, Hon. JOHN W.**, Globe Building, St. Paul, Minn.
 President Particular Council of St. Paul, Society St. Vincent de Paul.
- WILSON, GEORGE S.**, District Building, Washington, D. C.
 Secretary Board of Charities of the District of Columbia.
- WOLF, SIMON**, Fourteenth and G streets NW., Washington, D. C. X
 Founder and President Hebrew Orphans' Home, Atlanta, Ga.
 One of the Founders of the Cleveland (Ohio) Hebrew Orphans' Home and of the German Orphan Asylum of the District of Columbia.
- Formerly:
 President Board of Children's Guardians, District of Columbia.
 Member Board of Charities of the District of Columbia.
- WOLFENSTEIN, Dr. S.**, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum.
- WOODS, Miss HELEN A.**, 821 Main street, Worcester, Mass.
 Superintendent Worcester Children's Friend Society.
- WOODWARD, Mrs. S. W.**, 2015 Wyoming avenue, Washington, D. C.
 Member Board of Washington City Orphan Asylum.
- YOUNG, Mrs. ANNIE L.**, Salt Lake City.
 City Probation Officer and Matron of Juvenile Court of Utah.

Note.—All of the above, with a few exceptions, accepted the invitation and were present at the sessions of the conference.

OFFICERS

Chairman

PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Vice-Chairmen

**HON. HOMER FOLKS, HON. THOMAS M. MULRY,
Judge JULIAN W. MACK.**

Secretary

Mr. JAMES E. WEST.

COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS

**Mr. JAMES E. WEST, Chairman. HON. HOMER FOLKS,
HON. THOMAS M. MULRY.**

PRESS COMMITTEE

DR. EDWARD T. DEVINE, Chairman.

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Mr. THEODORE DEWESE, | Mr. GEORGE L. SEHON, |
| Dr. CHARLES F. McKENNA, | Mr. MAX MITCHELL, |
| Mr. CHARLES F. WELLER, | Mr. WM. B. BUCK. |

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| HASTINGS H. HART, LL. D., Chairman. | Judge JULIAN W. MACK, |
| HON. EDMOND J. BUTLER, | HON. HOMER FOLKS, |
| Mr. JAMES E. WEST. | |

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE ON THE CARE OF
DEPENDENT CHILDREN CALLED BY PRESIDENT
THEODORE ROOSEVELT TO MEET AT WASH-
INGTON, D. C., JANUARY 25-26, 1909.**

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE

MONDAY AFTERNOON.

JANUARY 25, 1909.

The conference was called to order by the President at the White House at 2.30 o'clock p. m., its members having been received by President and Mrs. Roosevelt.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In greeting you here I wish to say a word of special appreciation of the sacrifice which has been entailed upon you in coming. In this country much can be done by governmental work; but the governmental work will go for nothing unless we continue to be able to call upon bodies like this which I am addressing to do the disinterested work which you have done in coming here. It is a fine thing for you to have come; it is a fine thing that you are doing; and I thank you in the name of our people as a whole.

There can be no more important subject from the standpoint of the nation than that with which you are to deal; because, when you take care of the children you are taking care of the nation of to-morrow; and it is incumbent upon every one of us to do all in his or her power to provide for the interests of those children whom cruel misfortune has handicapped at the very outset of their lives.

I earnestly hope that the members of this conference will take a progressive stand, so as to establish a goal toward which the whole country can work. In other words, I earnestly hope that each of you will consider not only the interests of his own immediate locality but the interests of the nation as a whole. There are of course several different types of conditions which you are trying to meet. I believe that we all of us have come to the conclusion that where possible the thing to be done for the child is to provide a home for it; and that where that is not possible, we should make the conditions as nearly as possible like those which the child would have in a home. There is ample room for all existing agencies, and they should naturally modify their methods from time to time in the light of wider experience and of changing conditions. The work of extension should so far as possible be a work of extension in home placing; and where that is not possible, to make the conditions surrounding the child that can not be put in a home as nearly as possible like those which would obtain were the child in a home.

There are half a dozen different types of children for whom we need to care. There is first of all the complete orphan, the child who has lost both father and mother. For this child we wish to make permanent provision. My own belief is that the best kind of permanent provision, if feasible, is to place that child in a home. We then have to meet the case—one of the most distressing of cases—where the

father has died, where the breadwinner has gone, where the mother would like to keep the child, but simply lacks the earning capacity. Surely in such a case the goal toward which we should strive is to help that mother, so that she can keep her own home and keep the child in it; that is the best thing possible to be done for that child. How the relief shall come, public, private, or by a mixture of both, in what way, you are competent to say and I am not. But I am competent to say what I think the goal should be. Then we come to the case of the child who must temporarily be taken away from the parent or parents, but where it is not desirable that the separation should be permanent. There are other problems, of course, that you will have to deal with—for instance, the crippled child, the child that can not be treated at home for a disease, but yet can be completely cured in a hospital; and the case of the child whose parents are hopelessly vicious or hopelessly inefficient. Here we must provide for the exercising of the greatest wisdom obtainable in knowing just where to draw the line; so as to know just when it becomes necessary to say that even the undoubted advantages of keeping the child in a pretty poor home if that home is its own are counterbalanced by the fact that the home has become not a source of benefit, but a source of menace and danger to the child. You will have to consider a dozen such problems.

The Government can do much. But never forget that the Government can not do everything; there must always be help by individuals and associations outside; that religious and philanthropic associations of many different kinds must cooperate with the Government or we can not get the best results. Another thing as to the Government itself. Remember always that "government" is not merely an abstract term. The government consists of the men in it, and if you do not have the right men handling any part of a great governmental system, then that part will work badly. In the last analysis the human equation is the vital equation in dealing with all these questions. The wit of man can not devise a system so perfect that it will work well unless it is worked by men both good and wise and unless outsiders who take a genuine interest in the matter also give their aid and exercise their supervision.

It is, of course, impossible for me to preside permanently at the meetings of the conference and accordingly I am going to suggest as vice-chairmen, who shall preside at the various meetings in my absence, Mr. Homer Folks, Mr. Thomas M. Mulry, and Judge Julian W. Mack, with, as secretary, Mr. James E. West.

If any member of the conference desires to put any other names in nomination I shall be pleased to have him do so. If not, I will ask those of you who approve of the selection of the gentlemen I have named as vice-chairmen and secretary to signify the same by saying "aye."

Contrary minded, "no."

The "ayes" have it, and Messrs. Folks, Mulry, and Mack will act as vice-chairmen and Mr. West as secretary.

I will ask Mr. Mulry to preside at the public meeting which will be held at the New Willard to-night, and when in the course of a few minutes I shall unfortunately be obliged to leave this confer-

ence, I shall ask Mr. Folks to take the chair and to arrange with the other vice-chairmen as to who shall preside at the other sessions of the conference.

I shall have the pleasure of coming in for a short time at the dinner to-morrow evening to receive the report and conclusions of the conference and to thank you for your work.

I now ask the committee on arrangements, which I appointed to go through the necessary preliminaries in providing for this gathering, to make a report as to the programme and the rules.

The SECRETARY (Mr. James E. West). As chairman of the committee on arrangements I have the honor to submit the following report:

While the limited time available has naturally been a handicap, the committee has definitely secured as speakers practically all of those announced in the printed programme, a copy of which has been furnished each person present.

Those who will open the discussion of the propositions suggested in the memorandum accompanying the President's letter of invitation are as follows:

1. Should there be established in one of the federal departments a national children's bureau, one of whose objects shall be the collection and dissemination of accurate information in regard to child-caring work and in regard to the needs of children throughout the United States.

Miss LILLIAN D. WALD, Member National Child Labor Committee.

Mr. MORNAY WILLIAMS, President Children's Village, New York City.

Hon. JAMES R. GARFIELD, Secretary of the Interior.

2. Should the State inspect the work of all child-caring agencies, including both institutions and home-finding societies.

Mr. AMOS W. BUTLER, Secretary State Board of Charities, Indiana.

Mr. HUGH F. FOX, President State Board of Children's Guardians, New Jersey.

3. Should the approval of the state board of charities (or other body exercising similar power) be necessary to the incorporation of all child-caring agencies, and to an amendment of the charter of an existing benevolent corporation, if it is to include child-caring work; and should the care of children by other than incorporated agencies be forbidden.

Mr. ROBERT W. HEBBERD, Commissioner of Charities, New York City.

Mr. TIMOTHY D. HURLEY, President Visitation and Aid Society, Illinois.

4. Should children of parents of worthy character, but suffering from temporary misfortune, and the children of widows of worthy character and reasonable efficiency, be kept with their parents—aid being given the parents to enable them to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children. Should the breaking of a home be permitted for reasons of poverty, or only for reasons of inefficiency or immorality.

Mr. MICHAEL J. SCANLAN, President New York Catholic Home Bureau.

Mr. ERNEST P. BICKNELL, President Conference Charities and Correction 1909.

Mr. JAMES F. JACKSON, Superintendent Associated Charities, Cleveland, Ohio.

5. Should children normal in mind and body, and not requiring special training, who must be removed from their own homes, be cared for in families wherever practicable.

Rabbi EMIL G. HIRSCH, President National Conference Jewish Charities.

Rt. Rev. D. J. McMAHON, Supervisor Catholic charities, New York City.

Miss JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. DAVID F. TILLEY, Member Massachusetts state board of charities.

Dr. HASTINGS H. HART, Chairman Study Child Placing, Russell Sage Foundation.

6. So far as institutions may be necessary, should they be conducted on the cottage plan; and should the cottage unit exceed 25 children.

Dr. R. R. REEDER, Superintendent Orphan Asylum Society of New York City.

Mr. GALEN A. MERRILL, Superintendent Minnesota State Public Schools.

Mr. ADOLPH LEWISOHN, President Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, New York City.

7. Should the state educational authorities exercise supervision over the educational work of orphan asylums and kindred institutions.

Dr. ELMER E. BROWN, Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C.

Mr. WILLIAM B. STREETER, Superintendent North Carolina Children's Home Society.

8. Should child-caring agencies aim to cooperate with each other and with other agencies of social betterment for the purpose of diminishing or removing altogether the causes of orphanage, of child destitution, and child delinquency.

Prof. CHARLES R. HENDERSON, Ph. D., President National Children's Home Society.

Hon. THOMAS W. HYNES, President Superior Council, St. Vincent de Paul Society, Brooklyn, N. Y.

9. Would it be helpful and desirable if some permanent committee or organization comparable to the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, the National Child Labor Committee, etc., could be established for the purpose of carrying on an active propaganda with a view of securing better laws in relation to children, better organization of child-caring agencies, and better methods of relief and aid to children throughout the United States.

Mr. CHARLES W. BIRTWELL, General Secretary Boston Children's Aid Society.

Mrs. JOHN M. GLENN, formerly Secretary Charity Organization Society, Baltimore, Md.

As far as practicable the committee asked for suggestions from everyone invited to the conference as to any other relevant questions which they might desire to have discussed. Careful consideration was given to all of the replies and the committee respectfully recommends the following additional propositions for discussion:

10. Should every child-caring agency—

(a) Secure full information concerning the character and circumstances of the parents or surviving parent or near relatives of each child admitted to its care, through personal investigation by its own representative, unless adequate information is supplied by some admitting agency?

(b) Inform itself by personal investigation, at least once each year, of the circumstances of the parents or surviving parents of children in its charge, unless this information is supplied by some other responsible agency.

(c) Exercise supervision over children leaving their care until such children become self-supporting, unless such children are legally adopted or returned to their parents?

(d) Make a permanent record of all the information thus secured?

11. Should the sending of children to almshouses and their care therein be forbidden by law?

12. Should all agencies for placing children in families make a thorough investigation of the character and circumstances of all applications for children, including a personal visit to each family before placing a child therein. Should all such agencies exercise close and careful supervision over all children placed in families, such supervision to include personal visitation by trained agents, and careful inquiry as to the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual training of each child.

13. Should there be close cooperation between all child-caring agencies in each community, in order to promote harmony of action in regard to the admission of children, the relations of child-caring agencies to the parents or surviving parents of children admitted to their care, and the subsequent supervision of children leaving their care?

14. Should there be the freest opportunity for the placing of children in families without regard to state lines, excepting such reasonable provision as will insure each State against an improper burden of public dependence? Is it desirable that legislation enabling state boards of charities to exercise supervision over the placing-out work of both domestic and foreign corporations be uniform?

It seemed wise to the committee that the discussion of these propositions should be somewhat different than the order in which they are given. As a detailed programme for the proceedings the following is submitted:

PROGRAMME.

Monday afternoon: At the White House.

2.30.—Reception by the President.

Conference called to order by the President.

Report of the committee on preliminary arrangements.

Organization.

Discussion of topics Nos. 4, 2, 3, and 8.

Monday evening: At the New Willard Hotel.

8.00 p. m.—Public session.

General subject: Topics Nos. 4 and 5.

"A Word of Greeting from the District of Columbia." Hon. H. B. F. Macfarland, President Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"The Home Versus the Institution," by Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch, President of the National Conference of Jewish Charities.

"Family Influence," by Rt. Rev. D. J. McMahon, Supervisor of Catholic charities, Archdiocese of New York.

"Modern Devices for Minimizing Dependency," by Miss Jane Addams, President, Hull House, Chicago.

"Preservation of the Family Home," by Mr. David F. Tilley, Member State Board of Charities of Massachusetts.

"The Evolution of Child Placing," by Dr. Hastings H. Hart, Chairman Study of Child Placing, Russell Sage Foundation.

"Destitute Colored Children of the South," by Dr. Booker T. Washington, President Tuskegee Institute.

Tuesday morning: In the board room of the District building, Pennsylvania avenue and Fourteenth street.

9.30—Executive session:

Discussion of topics Nos. 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 12.

Tuesday afternoon: In the board room of the District building.

2 p. m.—Executive session:

Discussion of topics Nos. 9, 1, 13, and 14.

4 p. m.:

Report of the committee on resolutions.

Tuesday evening: In the New Willard Hotel.

7.30 (sharp)—Subscription dinner.

General subject: Further discussion of topic No. 1.

Speakers:

Miss Lillian D. Wald, Member National Child Labor Committee.

Mr. Mornay Williams, President Children's Village, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.

Rev. Francis H. Gavis, Member State Board of Charities of Indiana.

Hon. James Rudolph Garfield, Secretary of the Interior.

"The Significance of the Conference."

Hon. Hermann A. Metz, Comptroller, New York City.

Hon. Ben. B. Lindsey, Judge of the Juvenile Court, Denver, Colo.

Hon. Julian W. Mack, formerly Judge of the Juvenile Court, Chicago, Ill.

Report of the conference submitted Rules to the President and closing remarks by the President.

The following rules are recommended to govern the proceedings of the conference:

1. The selection of topics for discussion, the designation of speakers therefor, the arrangement of sessions, and the subjects to be taken up at each, as arranged by the committee on preliminary arrangements, are hereby approved and confirmed, and said committee is continued with power.

2. The President is hereby requested to appoint a committee on resolutions of five members.

3. The two speakers announced to open the discussion on each subject shall be allotted ten minutes each. Subsequent speakers shall not exceed five minutes, and no speaker shall speak more than once upon any subject, unless no other member of the conference desires the floor. It shall be the duty of the presiding officer, in recognizing persons desiring the floor, to secure the discussion of both the affirmative and the negative side of each proposition brought before the conference, if there be present those desiring to speak for and also those desiring to speak against the proposition.

4. All resolutions offered from the floor shall be referred forthwith, and without debate, to the committee on resolutions for consideration and such recommendation as may be determined upon. The committee on resolutions shall, if practicable, arrange for the publication of the proceedings of the conference, and shall edit the same.

5. The committee on resolutions shall report not later than 4 p. m., Tuesday, the 26th, its recommendations as to what appears to be the consensus of opinion of the conference upon the subjects brought before it for consideration, and no other business except the discussion upon these recommendations shall be in order until these recommendations have been finally acted upon.

These suggestions are respectfully submitted on behalf of the committee.

President ROOSEVELT. You have heard the report. What is your pleasure in reference thereto?

Mr. MACFARLAND. I move that it be accepted and adopted.

The motion was seconded.

President ROOSEVELT. It is moved and seconded that the report be accepted and adopted.

The question was put to the conference and the motion was agreed to.

President ROOSEVELT. In accordance with your wishes I appoint as the committee on resolutions Dr. Hastings H. Hart, Mr. Edmond J. Butler, Judge Julian W. Mack, Mr. Homer Folks, and Mr. James E. West, and I shall ask Mr. Folks to take the chair.

Let me say again before leaving how much I appreciate your having come here and the importance of the work which has brought you. I look forward to meeting you to-morrow evening, when I shall hear what plan or plans this body has adopted and what resolutions it presents. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Homer Folks). I am sure that in opening the discussions you would wish me to express at the outset the very sincere thanks of each member of this conference to our President for this manifestation of his interest in the care of dependent children, and I am sure that I shall best express my appreciation of his action by saying nothing more than that, and by recognizing the fact that we have many subjects to discuss, that our programme is likely to be extremely crowded, by urging each of you to omit all the unnecessary material in your participation in the discussions, all the formal introductions and the remarks that are customary on such occasions, and by proceeding at once, when your opportunity comes, to the heart of the subject and by sticking closely to the subject.

It will be necessary for us to enforce very closely the rule in regard to the amount of time to be allotted to each speaker. The two speakers whose names are printed in connection with each topic have been promised ten minutes each. They will be reminded when eight minutes have expired that but two minutes remain to their credit, and at the end of those two minutes they will be reminded more forcibly and impressively that the time limit has expired.

Subsequent speakers, as you have noticed from the reading of the suggested rules which you have adopted, are to be limited to five minutes each. They will be warned when four minutes have expired, and again warned at the expiration of the five minutes.

The topics indicated for discussion this afternoon are Nos. 4, 2, 3, and 8. As stated in the report of the committee on arrangements, we have departed from the order in which the topics were named in the printed schedule, because it seemed to us that perhaps, for the purposes of discussion, this would be a more logical order.

In introducing the speakers, I shall omit the many pleasant and complimentary things which it would be a great pleasure to say about them, and merely indicate to you, in a very brief way, the range of experience from which they speak to you.

Will the secretary kindly read proposition No. 4.

The secretary read as follows:

Should children of parents of worthy character, but suffering from temporary misfortune, and the children of widows of worthy character and reasonable efficiency, be kept with their parents—aid being given the parents to enable them to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children? Should the breaking of a home be permitted for reasons of poverty, or only for reasons of inefficiency or immorality?

The CHAIRMAN. The opening speaker will be Mr. Michael J. Scanlan, who was for some years a member of the state board of charities of New York, and who has long been one of the most active members of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, in that city, and who is the president of the New York Catholic Home Bureau for Dependent Children.

ADDRESS OF MR. MICHAEL J. SCANLAN, PRESIDENT CATHOLIC HOME BUREAU FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN, NEW YORK.

Mr. SCANLAN. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, when I first heard this proposition announced, it struck me that there could be no negative to it, and I said as much to the committee; but they assured me that there might be room for a difference of opinion. So I was induced to jot down a few arguments in favor of the maintenance of family relations, and in order that I may not transgress those stringent rules that have been reiterated here I have put my remarks in writing.

Should children of parents of worthy character, but suffering from temporary misfortune, and the children of widows of worthy character and reasonable efficiency, be kept with their parents—aid being given to the parents to enable them to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children? Should the breaking of a home be permitted for reasons of poverty, or only reasons of inefficiency or immorality?

The question now under discussion, as I apprehend it, is substantially this: Should workers in the field of charity make extraordinary efforts to preserve the family; should the children of those in destitute circumstances be kept with their parents or be taken from them and brought up elsewhere? In other words, should the family of those who have the misfortune to be poor be preserved rather than destroyed?

A recent writer on the social question says that there is now being conducted an uncompromising and undisguised attack upon the modern family by at least some of the scientific socialists and that to those who would substitute common ownership for individual liberty the institution of the family presents one of the most persistent obstacles. Again it has been said:

With the coming of the socialist state family unity will be merged in a higher end. The wife, being no longer doomed to household drudgery, will have the greater blessings of economic equality. Children will be cared for by the community under healthful and uniform conditions, and we shall arrive at what has been called "the happy time," when the continuity of society no longer depends upon the private nursery.

At a meeting held in New York City last Thursday, 21st instant, according to the newspaper report, the principal speaker said that it did not seem to her that the home as it existed to-day was such a satisfying institution that there should be any monumental fear in regard to its being changed.

I have made these quotations to emphasize the importance of the question now under consideration. There is really a battle on between those who would preserve the family and those who would

destroy it. There are forces at work not connected at all with charity tending to disrupt the family relation and there are people at work not connected with charity who are desirous of destroying family homes. As far as our work in charity goes, where should we be found? Should charitable workers range themselves on the side of those who would destroy modern civilization or on the side of those who believe in it and would preserve it, because it seems to be admitted by both the friends and the enemies of our modern society that the family is the great bulwark of our civilization.

For us Catholics there can be no question where we stand. The teaching of our church has always been in favor of the preservation of family ties, and the wisdom of this teaching has been commended by those separated from her. For us members of the society of St. Vincent de Paul there can likewise be no question as to where we stand. The special object of our society, its fundamental work, is the visiting of the poor at their homes. Our members are exhorted by all means to keep the family together. Funds are distributed liberally for that purpose. Situations are procured if necessary. It is only a very last resort and for very grave reasons and after many trials that a family group is broken up. And if because of the dissipated lives of parents the household is dispersed, our members are keen to discover symptoms of reformation so that they can rehabilitate that household again. By following out these rules we frequently have the happiness and consolation of seeing the children of those who have been on our relief rolls grow up to be respected and useful members of society. The question here discussed could not be the subject of debate at a meeting of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, because the maintenance of the family is so much a part of our creed.

At the National Conference of Charities the necessity of preserving the family has always been emphasized and the means pointed out. I quote from a paper read by Mr. C. E. Faulkner, of Minneapolis, at the national conference held in Portland, Me., in the year 1904.

The separation of children by permanent decree from the company of delinquent parents may often remove the strongest aid to their reformation, and such an alternative should never be resorted to when avoidance is possible.

In a paper on the "Causes of poverty," submitted by Mr. Edmond J. Butler at the conference held in the city of Atlanta, in the year 1903, it was said:

The family, or domestic circle, is the means intended by nature for the development of the human race, and the normal family possesses all of the means necessary to properly develop its members and enable them to maintain themselves with independence and self-respect. It alone is peculiarly constituted and fitted by nature to give to man the means necessary for his happiness in this life. In its relation to the State the family occupies an equally important position. * * * In the aggregate of our families lies the strength or weakness of our social fabric.

In speaking of the modern tendency of the rich to send their children to boarding school instead of taking the trouble to rear them in the family, a modern writer has said:

Occasionally, no doubt, there may be an occurrence of domestic disaster or necessary rupture or unavoidable circumstances in which the deporting of a child to the custody of a stranger is advisable in the case of the rich as well as the poor. In general, however, the growth of the boarding school system is an indictment of the home. A school may be a better training place of child life than a home; but that is because the home for sufficient or insufficient reasons is not what it ought to be.

I fully indorse and approve what I have just quoted. It should be the cardinal aim of charity workers to keep intact the family circle of the poor. Children should be reared in the family where God Almighty has placed them, and while we know from sad experience that cases will arise where the removal of children from their homes is necessary, it should be done reluctantly and only where proper supervision at home has become impossible. Aid should be given to preserve the home in case of poverty, not public aid but aid such as is given by the St. Vincent de Paul Society; and even where children have the misfortune to have dissipated parents, some attempts at reformation should be made before the home is broken up.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make, on behalf of the committee on resolutions, the request that those who present papers hand them to the secretary, so that they may be received by the committee on resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The various speakers will kindly observe this request.

I wish to call the attention of those announced to participate in the discussion of Nos. 2, 3, and 8, that these papers are also scheduled for discussion to-day, after we discuss No. 4. The secretary will make an announcement with reference to the absence of Mr. Bicknell.

The SECRETARY. Until quite recently we had fully expected that Mr. Bicknell would be able to leave San Francisco in time to reach here for the conference, but a telegram from him has just reached me stating that it will be impossible. I am not sure that Mr. James F. Jackson, of Cleveland, received the word in time to prepare his paper. I know he is present, but I have not had time to see him to-day. However, we put him down on the programme in the hope that he would be able to speak to us, and I thought it due to Mr. Jackson to make this explanation to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Jackson is at present the executive officer of the Associated Charities of Cleveland. He has had a very wide experience as secretary of the Associated Charities of St. Paul, as secretary of the Minnesota state board of charities, and as secretary of the committee on dependent children of the Charity Organization Society of New York, a committee whose particular object was to assist in aiding in the maintenance of dependent children in their own homes. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. JAMES F. JACKSON, SUPERINTENDENT ASSOCIATED CHARITIES, CLEVELAND.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it has not always been possible for us to have the agreement of the church and the state relative to the care of children. To-day the state and the church have agreed as to what should be done for the child, as far as the question under consideration is concerned, and it simply rests upon laymen—the common, ordinary, every-day laymen in this tremendously democratic country of ours—to say that both the church and the state are just and wise and humane. And there is little more to say.

Civilization demands that a mother shall do more than bring up her child. When an animal is born and anything chances to happen to the mother, if it happens to find a foster mother that animal may grow

up; if not, it will have to die. But with the human species, we demand that the mother shall do more than simply bring up animals of the human kind. We demand that they shall educate their offspring; that they shall train them to be good citizens. Morally, mentally, and physically children must be educated. That education chiefly falls to the mother, and therefore it has come about with us that the mother is not expected to become the breadwinner. When anything happens to the breadwinner, if the mother is capable, it seems to be perfectly clear that it is our business, either as a state or as individuals, to see that she has material support. Always there should be individual friendliness as a part of such aid. Either the state or the individual, or the two in cooperation, should see that the mother has the necessities of existence, has the raw material, we may say, with which to care for the children and provide the home where she may educate them. We make this demand upon her on the assumption that she has the capacity. Should she lack the capacity, if she is inefficient or below the community standard of morality, the mother is thereby unable to rear good men and women. Then we must help substitute capacity for her incapacity, or if that is impossible the children must be rescued from her.

The standard of the community in morality is easily stated, while its standard of efficiency is rather difficult to state. When a woman, after a few years of material aid, can not be taught to provide for her children, it usually indicates incapacity, and because of that incapacity it is not a good home for her children. Or if a woman becomes a beggar, her home is no better for the child than the home of an immoral woman, and the child has no better chance for good citizenship. Then it becomes necessary for us, under the adjudication made by the state and indorsed to-day by the church, to take away the child from the mother because she can not make a good citizen of that child. The question is, Will she develop a good citizen or a bad citizen?

As Mr. Scanlan has just said, it is up to us as individual societies. It is a work that can not remain entirely with the state; in fact, it is usually better for the state to take no part in the aid. It is the work of individual societies to see that she has a fair chance in the development of her child; that she not only has a fair chance, but has good backing, especially that she has friendship.

It seems to me, when we talk about starvation in this country, we must bear in mind that practically nobody starves in America who can digest food. But thousands are dying every year, morally and physically, from the lack of friendship. The dependent parent or parents are entitled to our friendly aid and our material support until they can prove whether or not they are capable of developing children to good citizenship. If they are incapable, then it is necessary that the children be taken from them.

I think there is one more point that may be fairly made. Whereas I think we all agree that the interests of the child entirely overbalance the interest of the parents, the welfare of the parents should be considered. When we take her children from a mother simply because of poverty, we subject her to temptations which frequently she is not able to bear. The child, in many instances, is the anchor that holds the woman to a good life, and in that good life she will herself bring up good children.

Then the mother has another interest which I think is perfectly fair to be considered; that is, the chance of being cared for in her old age. Every woman makes an investment with each child for care in her old age. If we have taken the child from an efficient mother simply because of poverty, we have robbed her of possible care in old age, and the injustice is as great as in any form of robbery.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that we are in accord—the state, the church, and the common democracy—in the conclusion that the home should not be broken up simply for reasons of poverty, and that children should be removed only for reasons of inefficiency or immorality. I thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The subject will now be thrown open for general discussion. The chair will endeavor to recognize those desiring the floor in the order in which they rise. You are asked to kindly step forward, if you will, and speak from the platform; but if the chairman, in recognizing you, does not state your name and your residence, it will be because he does not know your name and residence. Will you therefore, in that event, kindly state it clearly yourself, for the benefit of the secretary and the official stenographer?

The subject is open for discussion.

REMARKS BY MR. W. B. SHERRARD, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, SUPERINTENDENT NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY, ETC.

Mr. SHERRARD. Mr. Chairman, among my friends I am looked upon as a radical in regard to the rights of childhood, but I think the question as presented for consideration has only one side to it, namely, that we should help the parents to keep their children, bearing in mind this: That that provision is made conditioned that they are proper people themselves.

In South Dakota it is not the breaking up of homes that we are doing, but it is breaking up bad homes; and the country will not do what it ought to do for the children of the nation until it investigates every disreputable home in the land. I venture the assertion that I could send out half a dozen competent young women in the city of Washington who would find a thousand children in it who will grow up to be immoral or vicious or undesirable citizens if left to themselves. I believe the rights of children demand that they should be surrounded with pure, moral influence.

I want you to bear in mind another thing—that the physical ability to bring a child into the world does not constitute fatherhood and motherhood in the highest sense. There are men and women who have never been privileged to bring an immortal being into existence who in all the higher attributes of motherhood and fatherhood far surpass those who have, by the gratification of their animal passions, brought an immortal being into the world. For this reason I advocate and beg and plead that the children of the nation be surrounded with pure influences. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. We will now hear from Mr. Mornay Williams, of New York, president of the Children's Village, and a member of many of the philanthropic boards.

**REMARKS OF MR. MORNAY WILLIAMS, OF NEW YORK CITY,
CHAIRMAN NEW YORK CHILD-LABOR COMMITTEE, ETC.**

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President and ladies and gentlemen, I suppose that I am in a minority here to-day because I am not entirely convinced that even in the case of dependent children it is always best to leave them in their own homes. I say that not because I am not interested in the child, but because I am so profoundly interested in the child. I believe that for the child always the best thing should be done, and my own belief is that for the normal boy—not the abnormal boy, but the normal boy—at a certain age the discipline of the school is absolutely essential. My own conviction is that the greatness of England, for instance, is largely to be traced to her great public schools.

Now, in saying that I am not forgetful for one instant of the fact that the great public schools—Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Rugby, Marlborough, and all the rest of them—have again and again been visited by the sort of evils that you will find in institutions here to-day. Those of us who are familiar with institutions know, and ought to be willing to confess, that the institutions are often badly managed; that there are often epidemics of wrongdoing in them; but in spite of that, if we make the school what it ought to be the school will make the boy. One thing that we need to-day is not a false sentimentality, but a clear apprehension that if we are going to bring boys up to be the kind of citizens they ought to be—I am speaking more of boys than of girls, because for the boy especially the school is needed—you have got to remember that it is not merely the home influence, but it is the attrition of mind with mind and the discipline of school that is needed, and in many cases, even if it is only the poverty of the parents that has made the child the possible subject of lapses from the higher ideal, while not necessarily the fault of the parent, it is the fault of the home; and the home, though it may be a virtuous home, yet, simply because the parents have neither the ability by training nor the ability in resources to give the child education and the firm discipline that it needs, may be the making of the child into bad material for citizenship and life.

It is therefore that I, at least, stand for the proposition that there are cases, not infrequently, in which the school should be the place in which the boy for a period is reared before he should be returned either to his own home, or, if his own home can not receive him, then to some other home. I speak of that out of the experience I have had with street boys. To my mind—I may be dreaming—the street boy is the great problem of to-day. The President well said that the boys of to-day are the citizens of to-morrow; and, trust me, my friends, the thing that we have to face as citizens here is that we are breeding at home the destroyers of our civilization.

Now, it is not the delinquent child I am speaking about. I am talking about a boy who has just as great capabilities of development as your boy, but who has not, because of the necessary conditions of poverty in which he has been born, learned how to lead life aright, and for him I say that there are very often cases where the good school is better than the home.

For that reason I am not willing to admit the general proposition that the home is always better, even for poor children, than the school.

The home ought to have its influence on the school; and when I speak of the school I speak of it as a temporary expedient only. I never wish to institutionalize a boy, and I think in the school it is absolutely essential that you shall bring the conditions under which the boy lives as nearly to home conditions as you can, and then always put him back for a brief term in some home, either his own or another. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF DR. EDWARD T. DEVINE, OF NEW YORK CITY, EDITOR CHARITIES AND THE COMMONS.

Doctor DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in complete agreement with the view that has just been expressed by Mr. Williams as to the value of the institution in a good many instances in which the parents are not of vicious character and in which the child has not been pronounced in any definite way a delinquent. I think that I have always had a somewhat higher estimate of the value of the institution in a great city than many of those who are here in the conference. I believe, as Mr. Williams has said, that there are instances in which the only possible relief to a widowed mother or to parents when the wage-earner for some reason or other can not support the family is to temporarily lighten the burden by transferring to the care of the institution some of the children in order that the parents may give adequate care to the children that remain.

What I rose to say especially, however, was not that, but to express an opinion suggested by the original paper which opened the discussion. I think that notwithstanding the general agreement that there possibly is in this conference and in the national conference and in the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and in most of the other constituent societies represented here in regard to the family, it nevertheless is wise, as Mr. Scanlan suggested, that we should put ourselves on record on that subject. For one, with him, I am against socialism when it makes any attack on the institution of the family. I happen to be also against it when it makes an attack on private property, but that is not what we are here discussing. What we do have a right to discuss here is the value of the family, and to put ourselves on record, in the strongest possible way, against any insidious and subtle attacks upon the institution of the family, from whatever source.

Undoubtedly there may be some danger to the family—I do not myself think it is very great, but there may be some danger to the family—from socialistic agitation and propaganda. In so far as there is any such danger, it behooves all of us to rally to its defense and to put ourselves on record at the very earliest possible moment and in the very strongest possible way.

But it occurs to me there is another danger to the integrity of the family which is very great indeed, and which should be referred to before this particular part of our discussion is closed. I refer to those things which might be prevented in the community the result of which is to deprive the family of the support of the natural wage-earner during the period when the children are usually dependent upon his help. I happen to have had to do with a particular inquiry in one industrial community during the past year, in the course of which we learned that in that community during a single year over 500 men met death by industrial accidents, leaving families either in this

country or in the old country dependent upon the State or upon charitable assistance. I happen to know that in that same community more than 500 persons died of typhoid in the same year. Now, these preventable deaths by industrial accidents and preventable deaths by a preventable disease are a menace to the integrity of the family about which there can be no doubt whatever. [Applause.] Every one of these deaths means in some way or other a broken home. The community should not only provide charitable assistance in those instances in which charitable assistance is necessary, but it should go behind that need and protect the family by safeguarding it against dangers of which I have cited two illustrations, and they are illustrations of a very large number. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF MR. A. W. CLARK, SUPERINTENDENT CHILD SAVING INSTITUTE, OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President and ladies and gentlemen, I just want to say a word in favor of keeping parent and children together, growing out of eighteen years of experience and consecutive work for the dependent children.

Fifteen or sixteen years ago it was easy for a poor man or a poor mother in great poverty to persuade me to let her or him sign the papers of relinquishment because of this extreme poverty, and I would receive the child. Now, after placing or directly controlling the placement of nearly 2,000 children, I am convinced that at that time I made some very great mistakes. Fourteen years ago, when I began to realize the necessity, as it seemed to me, of keeping parents and children together, I began to study the question of going beyond simply the matter of poverty, and when I found inefficiency I began to try to find some way to overcome the inefficiency. I want to say that for the past fourteen years when a case of this sort is brought to me I assume it is possible to overcome inefficiency and to arrange it and make it possible for the child to stay with the parent. Then in the case of immorality it is exactly the same. I began to assume years ago that it might be possible to overcome those conditions that are immoral at the time. I have in mind an instance. Fourteen years ago last month, I think it was, my attention was called to a mother locked up in jail. I went to her and found that there was inefficiency in her past life, that there was immorality. Her little girl was 4 years of age. She wanted to sign the papers of relinquishment. I allowed her to sign them and I took the little girl. Then I said to the mother, "Now, it is possible for you to have this child with you later." I found a position for the mother afterwards, and I expended \$500 in the care of that child in private homes and in the Child Saving Institute of which I am superintendent; and at the end of the two years I restored this little girl to her mother, who was in a position, showing that she was a moral, good woman, and from that time to the present she has maintained her position as such, the little girl being in the home, and six months ago she took the silver medal in an oratorical contest which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union gave, a little later the gold medal, and just a few weeks ago the grand gold medal in the oratorical contest. It is a beautiful home

I had all kinds of chances to place that little girl. One millionaire begged for her, and there were others who wanted her. I said, "No; there is the mother of that child." I want to say further that, growing out of these experiences of eighteen years, I believe that the relationship between a mother and her child is a different relationship than that which ever exists between foster parent and children. It is stronger, it is more vital, and I believe that we are bound to devise ways and means for the keeping of parents and children together when it is possible to do so. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF MR. MAX MITCHELL, OF BOSTON, MASS., SUPERINTENDENT FEDERATED JEWISH CHARITIES.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I have written down a few remarks here.

Should children of parents of worthy character, but suffering from temporary misfortune, and the children of widows of worthy character and reasonable efficiency be kept with their parents, aid being given to the parents to enable them to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children? Should the breaking of a home be permitted for reasons of poverty, or only for reasons of inefficiency or immorality?

I believe we are fairly agreed that the children of parents who are of worthy character, but suffering from temporary misfortunes, children of widows of good character and reasonable efficiency, when life and conditions of their homes are normal, are best cared for by remaining in the custody of their parents. We realize that the best place for the child is its own home. It is best for the child, it gives strength and ambition to the parents, it raises the morals and responsibility of parents to children, and forms a world of love and fellowship. I firmly believe that under conditions heretofore mentioned sufficient relief is the best help, instead of separating the family and placing the child out into a good home. Harm is caused by such separation, for at best a substituted home is not the natural home.

The placing of children in private families is an expense, and, if the original home lacks in desirability, the tone of the home can be raised by giving the mother the same payment for the board of the children as is incurred through placing them in a private family or maintaining them in an institution. But provision for the right kind of a home should be made by insisting upon a home standard which would insure the proper bringing up of the child.

These cases, however, should only be dealt with by experts of the best knowledge and the widest experience, such as are able to properly devise the form of home and the kind of relief.

No home should be allowed to be broken because of poverty, as poverty is often but a temporary state or condition, and quite frequently the poor know how to bring up their children even better than the more fortunate ones. Very often with good people the children are the incentive for higher ideals and the desire for better conditions, while the breaking up of the family usually means a smaller need, and often the abandonment of zeal and the relaxation of higher aims.

Instead of breaking up a home and paying for the board of her children in a private family, while the mother is taught a trade under the impression that she will develop an earning capacity, let the amount involved be paid to the mother in the exercise of her

own trade, which she already knows—a mother's trade—the bringing up of her children, the highest and noblest calling, the making of good men and women.

She earns much more by the contribution of her devotion to her children than by her small commercial competence, often at the expense of personal caliber and sometimes at the expense of personal purity. The sanctity of the home of good competent people must be preserved at all hazards.

The question that should give us the most concern is the child of the well-meaning but incompetent parent, the child of the imbecile, the child of the consumptive, of the drunkard, of the immoral, the criminal, the inefficient, the child of the weak and careless parent—in a word, the child who has no home influences, no character building. Such a child is left to build its own character on the corners of the streets or after the loose ways of its parents. This is the child whose fate and future is a nightmare to the thinking men and women of our day. To this child, who begins life with the tide set against it, we must come with our lifeboats, as it were, for in the great and turbulent ocean of life it is likely soon to be swamped and swallowed unless we see the danger and rush effectively to its aid.

However, to keep a bad and inefficient home together and help build men and women with bad characters or no character, is a crime against humanity.

We owe it to the child and to the parent of the irresponsible sort to substitute the effective medium in the form of a proper home to make of the children men and women who shall be useful to their fellow-men.

Children of such parents should come under the guidance of organizations competent to deal with them and all their peculiarities. Such organizations should substitute a good private family that possesses plainly the requisite capacity for rebuilding the instable foundation and superstructure of the unfortunate child's character.

No country can be great whose people are weak. Her general strength comes from the strength of her individuals, and the material conditions are only a reflection of the character of her people.

A nation best fortifies herself through the caliber of her citizenship. Our nation is wise in making mankind her business.

Obviously it is our self-interest as a people to help such children as can not help themselves to become strong men and women.

REMARKS OF DR. WILLIAM P. SPRATLING, OF BALTIMORE, MD., EDITOR TRANSACTIONS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF EPILEPSY; FORMERLY MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT OF THE CRAIG COLONY FOR EPILEPTICS, SONYEA, N. Y.

Doctor SPRATLING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say only a word, and that is, that my sentiments along this line agree very closely with those expressed by Mr. Mornay Williams and by Doctor Devine.

Wherever you find delinquent and dependent children you are almost sure to find chronic disease of some kind or other; and it is not possible to satisfactorily treat or care for children in such homes.

And here is another point that is often as prohibitive of good treatment as it is possible for almost any material factor to be, and that is, the influence of parental sympathy.

Very often parents with the best possible meaning unwittingly set aside all good that is being done the child simply through the display

of sympathy; through letting the child do what it wants to do and not what it should do.

In some cases like these kindness can be almost as destructive of good results as harshness, and the only way in which the evil condition in the child can be successfully combatted is to remove the child from its home and place it in some place that from every point of view is as nearly like the home as possible.

We ought to strive continually to preserve the home, but let us not forget that it is just as important to preserve those who are to live in it; and if the child of to-day is lost through neglect or through bad policy, then we lose the adult, the responsible citizen, of to-morrow.

Where substitutes for home life in the past have fallen short in doing that which we had a right to expect of them has been in the fundamental nature, in the very type of these places. Provide small cottages; furnish them and conduct them like homes—like real homes—and “institutionalism” will lose most of its evil features.

REMARKS OF HON. JULIAN W. MACK, OF CHICAGO, ILL., JUDGE OF CIRCUIT COURT, COOK COUNTY.

Judge MACK. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the question that is put, it is not the one touched upon by the last speaker or by Mr. Williams. The sole proposition is, shall parents, merely because of poverty, be deprived of their children? Now, if the child, because of its own delinquency, is to be taken away from home, of course let it be cared for somewhere. The question whether it should be in another home or in an institution is another point of discussion hereafter. But the question before us now is, shall a parent, merely because of poverty, not because of inefficiency, not because of disease of any kind, whether it be that sympathetic disease alluded to or physical or mental disease, be deprived of the care and custody of the child? To that I can see but one answer. That answer of course is in the negative. I can not understand why poverty alone should give anybody the right to deprive that child of that which it needs most in life—its own parents' love and care and sympathy [applause]; to deprive the parent of that which he or she needs most in life, the love and the support of the child, the reciprocal relations between the parent and the child.

In my personal experience I know of nothing sadder than the case of children that were taken away, or the case of the mother who came into the juvenile court ready to give up her child, ready to give it up merely because of poverty. I saw the twofold danger, the danger to the child in losing that mother's love and companionship, no matter how good a substitute we might find in any institution or in any foster home, and I saw again, time after time, the terrible danger that confronted the young mother without proper stay in the world except that child's love, forced to go out and fight the battle alone in the big cities. [Applause.]

We must not look at it solely from the standpoint of the child, although looking at it from that standpoint there can be but one answer to this question; but we must look at it, as one of the former speakers has said, from the standpoint also of the parent, and that brings me to a criticism of the phraseology of this question—“worthy parent.” I should include under the word “parent” many a mother

of an illegitimate child [applause], because if we stop that mother from giving away her child, and we can stop it in many cases if we will only see that she has work or gets the means of life without going out to work, if she is supplied with the money to keep her child in her own home, it is in that case particularly that we are going to save not only the child but the mother too—the mother possibly from a life of immorality. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the chair will suggest a three-minute limit, in order that we may hear from a considerable number in the next fifteen minutes.

**REMARKS OF REV. WILLIAM McMAHON, OF CLEVELAND, OHIO,
EDITOR OF CATHOLIC UNIVERSE.**

Father McMAHON. Just a few words, ladies and gentlemen.

The resolution now under consideration contemplates the bestowal of aid upon worthy widows overwhelmed by misfortune and burdened with poverty, so that the family may be kept together.

We all realize that "there is no place like home," no matter how humble it may be. The greatest and most widespread outcry against slavery was raised because of the consequent breaking up of families and the disregard of the ties of natural affection. This conference, I am sure, will not advocate the severing of these ties in a civilized community and among Christian people unless dire necessity compels.

The institutional care of children causes the inevitable separation of the members of a family. The resolution contemplates that the State or the community should assist the worthy widow who is struggling heroically against poverty to bring up her children properly, and thus preserve the home. Why not extend a helping hand to the widow in her distress?

I know of many cases where widows in the sweat of their brows have successfully striven to keep their children together. The children, strengthened by advancing time and becoming wage-earners, have lovingly said: "Mother, we can now care for you, and we will. Take a rest from your toil, and do not go out longer to labor." The bonds of affection and gratitude are thus strengthened in the hearts of the mother and her children.

This resolution does not contemplate that the children will be deprived of proper schooling. As the agent should not usurp the place or the duties of his principal, so neither should the State nor the community usurp the rights of the mother to her child. We should not return to the conditions prevalent of old in Sparta. We should cooperate as far as possible to keep the home intact. The home develops individuality and character and goes to the making out of the children stanch and worthy citizens.

The parable of the good Samaritan should teach us a valuable lesson. Our Lord after relating the parable asks: "Who was neighbor to him who fell among the robbers?" He does not ask: "Who is your neighbor?" but "To whom are you a neighbor?"

In this sense of neighborly love all who can should lend a helping hand to the struggling widows who are battling for home and children. The resolution contemplates that assistance should be given to this most deserving class of heroines.

This conference, composed of intelligent and charitable delegates from all parts of the country and from all classes and creeds, will not, I am sure, advocate that brave hearts struggling against misfortune and poverty and bound together by ties of natural affection, should be separated by the State sending the children to institutions. Such care can be no real substitute for the good mother; no institution can take her place.

As Mr. Scanlon has said, I believe, that there can be only one side to this question. Preserve the home and home life where possible. Cultivate individuality and build up character in the child. For the development of these, "There is no place like home, be it ever so humble." [Applause.]

REMARKS OF MR. GEORGE L. SEHON, OF LOUISVILLE, KY., STATE SUPERINTENDENT KENTUCKY CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY, ETC.

Mr. SEHON. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I believe it is almost a criminal act to take children from their families unless it is absolutely imperative. When a mother is dependent and has a family, she feels that dependency keenly, and it seems to me an outrage to add to that sorrow by taking away the only bright light in her life—her children. God has fitted her to care for her children. Their lives may not meet the ideals of the higher critics, but she can rear them to be honest boys and girls. Child workers are too prone to take children without investigation. Sometimes, in order to make their work larger, to say they have handled a large number, the children are taken without the thorough investigation that should be made.

I am proud to tell you to-day that in Kentucky we handle almost as many children as are handled in any other State in the Union, and that fully 75 per cent of the children are left with their mothers or with their relatives. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF DR. HASTINGS H. HART, OF CHICAGO, ILL., SUPERINTENDENT CHILDREN'S HOME AND AID SOCIETY OF ILLINOIS.

Doctor HART. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this matter with a view to getting the consensus of the resolution we are expected to prepare on this matter. I discover only one point that seems to be a point of very sharp difference when we analyze it. The first speaker said he thought the relief to be given to mothers to enable them to keep their own children should be entirely private relief. The second speaker thought it might be either private or public relief.

I wish we could know what is the sentiment of this convention on that question, as to whether private relief should be provided in all these cases, or whether this is an exception to the sentiment that many of us hold against outdoor relief.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the chair would be inclined to rule that out of order, Mr. Hart, because if we go into public outdoor relief versus private relief, we are apart from our general field, and we shall never get through. The question is whether each community, by the methods of relief which it has in that community by its own elected policy, should afford aid, and I think we would get pretty far afield if we should attempt to thrash out the difference between private and public relief.

REMARKS OF MARTIN A. MARKS, OF CLEVELAND, OHIO, DIRECTOR JEWISH ORPHAN ASYLUM, CHAIRMAN ORPHANS' GUARDIAN FUND, IMPROVED ORDER OF RED MEN, AND CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATIONS OF THE CLEVELAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Mr. MARKS. Mr. Chairman, in the list of names I am placed here as a representative of the Jewish Orphan Asylum at Cleveland, though identified with numerous other activities, and I can speak on this question probably from the standpoint of that orphan asylum after thirty years' experience as a director of that institution, which I believe is the nearest approach to a home made by human hands, principally because of the life-long devotion and service of its able superintendent, Dr. S. Wolfenstien. Recognizing the benefits that come from an institution of that kind, I can speak of the other plan in this way. A great fraternal order in this country, namely, the Improved Order of Red Men (nonsectarian), numbering 440,000 members, asked me to prepare some plan by which they could care for the orphan children of the deceased members of that fraternity, and I had the pleasure to present a plan that has been inaugurated and by which they care for the orphan children—full and half orphans—entirely independent of institutions, by a per capita tax of 5 cents on all members of the order, enabling the mother or some relative of the child to care for the child by furnishing a stipend by which the child retains the home life. [Applause.] And these children are visited frequently by the guardians appointed by this organization.

I know it is impossible in the three minutes allotted to me to explain the plan, but I think the question has been solved by them. For six years this plan has been in operation, and I am glad to say that homes have been provided in this manner for 575 orphan children, and they have been prevented from becoming institutional children, which is the objection that is made by charity workers. We have the statistics, the blanks, and the plan and the actual experience and I believe most firmly that this method is a solution of the question for organizations of all kinds. I will gladly submit the facts and figures to those interested.

REMARKS OF MISS FRANCES GREELY CURTIS, MEMBER MASSACHUSETTS STATE BOARD OF CHARITIES, BOSTON, MASS.

Miss CURTIS. One point that has not been brought out should be mentioned, in spite of the fact that everybody knows it. It is a sad fact that when children are taken away, supposed temporarily, from their parents, for reasons of poverty or illness, they are allowed to remain by parents through carelessness and desire for economy; the pauperized spirit gets into those parents when the children are, as they know, well cared for, not by themselves, is a very serious evil. The removal of children, even temporarily, in my mind, is not to be compared with the advantages of the payment to the parent of a certain amount of money by a friend at regular intervals, and a stated income, with no question of doubt or uncertainty. That applies to the question of the widow with children, particularly. A stated income, coming from friends, has the advantage of preserving independence both in mother and children in a way that the removal

of the children does not ever bring about, and brings good results to mother and children. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The chair now recognizes Mr. Macfarland, of the District of Columbia, who desires to extend an invitation.

REMARKS OF HON. HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MACFARLAND. I regret that I am not able to remain until the close of this afternoon's conference. The commissioners are engaged to-day in their annual conference with the Senate Committee on Appropriations upon the district budget for the next year. Therefore I have to say at this time that we are most happy to have the conference in Washington and that we are most happy to have you hold the sessions of to-morrow in the hall of our District government building, at Fourteenth street and Pennsylvania avenue. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The chair is disposed to recognize only two more speakers on this subject. That will have constituted 10 per cent of the entire membership of the conference.

REMARKS OF DR. SAMUEL M'CUNE LINDSAY, PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL LEGISLATION IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, OF NEW YORK CITY.

Doctor LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, the leading questions raised in this resolution is reference to the breaking of the relations of parent and child in dealing with children that must necessarily be dealt with by others than their parents, and it asks the question whether poverty shall be considered a sufficient reason for breaking that relationship.

I take it, from the trend of the discussion, that the answer pretty generally given here will be no. If that answer is accepted, it places upon us the responsibility of dealing with the question of poverty, and raises a further question how to remove the condition of poverty that otherwise would break up this relationship.

Reference has already been made to some of the conditions that tend to break up the home. I want to refer to one thing that has come to my personal knowledge in dealing with some of the evils of child labor and the efforts to abolish them. It is not always sufficiently clear even to those who are working for the best interests of children, that in attempting to overcome the conditions of poverty and to preserve the relationship of parent and child, one way not to accomplish the greatest good is to let the child go prematurely to work. By so doing you may seem to be dealing wisely with an individual case, and you may be breaking down standards and shutting the door of opportunity to thousands of other children, and you may be creating as great an evil as any other that has been named here that contributes to the breaking up of the normal relations of the home. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM H. DE LACY, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT, ETC.

Judge DE LACY. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, I want to say amen to everything that Judge Mack has said in regard to the preservation of the family. [Applause.] In all this work, ladies and

gentlemen, it seems to me that we should be extremely careful not to work at these people, but to work with them. Their standards are not our standards, perhaps. God did not make us all alike, but in all this work that which is of primary importance to the state is the preservation of the family.

Now, it seems to me that in cases of poverty, in cases where the parents or the parent, or even the mother of an illegitimate child, finds it impossible to care for the children in the home, the state, or, if not the state, at least private charity, should come to the aid of that home. I agree with sociologists in their antagonism to outdoor relief, but it seems to me there is exception to every rule, and the preservation of the family in the case of a needy and lone mother would be the exception that I would urge in enforcing the rule against outdoor relief. Where the children must be cared for temporarily it is a great deal better to leave the children in the home and extend funds to the home. If we take the child out of the home by reason of poverty and place it in an institution there is another danger that we should guard against. We should be careful not to keep that child so long out of the home that the home will pass out of the heart of the child. There is little danger that the child will pass out of the hearts of those in the home, but I have seen very lamentable instances of girls kept in institutions for long periods of time and therein accustomed to standards of living above that of the home. When the girl was released to the home she found herself at variance with the parent, at variance particularly with the mother, so that she no longer cared to stay in the home, and she went out into the street. She was dissatisfied with the home conditions; she no longer had sympathy for the home; and in the effort that was made to save that child to herself and to the home there was unwittingly introduced the principle of disintegration within the home by keeping the child too long out of the home in the institution.

By all means, let us conserve the home, because the home after all is but the expression of the life of the individual in the family. You know in our Declaration of Independence, we declared that all men were endowed with certain inalienable rights—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and I say it is not in the power of even the omnipotent State to deprive the family of its life. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the chair will now proceed to announce the second topic for discussion. Will the secretary kindly read the second subject.

The secretary read as follows:

Should the State inspect the work of all child-caring agencies, including both institutions and home-finding societies.

The CHAIRMAN. The discussion of this subject is to be opened by Mr. Amos W. Butler, secretary of the state board of charities of Indiana. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. AMOS W. BUTLER, OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND., SECRETARY STATE BOARD OF CHARITIES.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman and friends, I am aware that the subject upon which I am to speak this afternoon is one upon which there may be great difference of opinion, and therefore I have attempted to present the subject as fully as possible, and largely out of experi-

ence, or theory that has been enacted into experience, in a western State.

In years past great numbers of dependent children were brought into some of the Western States. While some were placed with care and given supervision, others were not well placed and many became poor citizens or public charges. In consequence, some States have passed laws regulating the bringing of dependent children within their borders. The facts learned regarding these alien children were in part responsible for calling attention more forcibly to the existing local children's agencies.

A study of conditions in my own State has shown what may be true elsewhere, that while we have a number of good institutions for children, none of which are of large size, that are well equipped and carefully administered, there are others which are only nominally homes. In these, children are simply boarded, without proper training or discipline, and from them they are placed out in families without any proper investigation of the home and without after-supervision. In some no records are kept, and it is impossible to tell what became of the children who went forth.

I know a man who says he feels called to care for unfortunate children. He has a cottage in the country, containing four rooms and a covered porch. This he calls a children's home. Into it he has gathered, in addition to his own family, from twenty to twenty-five children. They are overcrowded, herded together, without proper attention or oversight. What kind of care and training can they receive? There is no incorporated organization. No public wards are received.

There have been home-finding agencies which for a fixed sum, varying in amount, relieved the county of the support of dependent children. The county authorities were satisfied to be relieved of this expense without ever inquiring what became of their wards. The children disappeared wholly from view.

These things are not all in the past. There has been no accurate information, to say nothing of oversight, of maternity homes, foundling homes, or baby farms. Recent investigation has brought to light the fact that there are in the city of Indianapolis alone 11 institutions that may be classed as maternity homes. Into these come women from other counties and other States and leave their offspring a public burden upon the local community. There are in Indianapolis 28 institutions or homes for foundlings. From these, children are placed out on any terms or no terms at all, simply to get rid of them. In my own State there are maternity homes, homes for foundlings, children's homes, and child-placing agencies. Some are wholly or partly supported from public funds; others are private enterprises. In caring for children all are doing a public service. Some are incorporated, others are not. All organizations or associations that receive any support whatever from the public funds or receive any public wards are under the supervision of the board of state charities. All children in family homes who are public wards are subject to the visitation and oversight of its agents. All articles of incorporation of any organization for the care of dependent children must be approved by it. All institutions that desire to receive wards from the juvenile courts—one of which is authorized in each county—must have its approval. The juvenile court-law gives

authority to this board to visit and inspect all institutions, both public and private, that care for dependent children.

It seems to me that where such organizations, institutions, or agencies are engaged in doing a service for the public, and where, as in some cases, they are incorporated and receive thereby a franchise or charter from the State, it is right and desirable that at least certain classes of them should be licensed or certified, and that all of them should be subject to inspection.

I believe it to be desirable for the institution as well as for the child and the State that there should be provision for official inspection of all children's agencies; for licensing such classes of institutions dealing with infants as have been shown to be injurious or destructive to child life or careless or neglectful in the disposition of children; for the visitation of all public wards in fosterhomes until they are adopted. Possibly with more experience I should be willing to go further.

It should be understood that this inspection, visitation, and licensing should be done by proper persons and in the proper way. I fully realize that it is possible to do these things in such a way as to arouse just criticism. They should be done by qualified persons, in a tactful and helpful manner, with a desire to assist, in every way possible, those who are charged with this important duty to children. No child should be made a public ward that can be reasonably well cared for by a good parent. Complete records should be kept of the children in institutions, of their antecedents and of their placement. The State is vitally interested in all its children. If they have property, even a small amount, its officers will see that a guardian is appointed therefor; that he gives bond; that he is answerable to the court; that he makes a regular written report. But if it is a child without property that is left, who thinks of having a guardian appointed for it or of having a regular report made to the court as to its condition, its progress and possibilities? Is not a child worth more than its property?

The CHAIRMAN. Topics Nos. 2 and 3 are closely related, and I therefore give notice that in the absence of objection we will have the opening addresses of both Nos. 2 and 3, and then follow with the discussion of each of these subjects.

The discussion of topic No. 2 will be continued by the president of the state board of children's guardians of New Jersey, Mr. Hugh F. Fox. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. HUGH F. FOX, PRESIDENT STATE BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS OF NEW JERSEY.

Mr. Fox. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to take it for granted that this is a gathering of persons of wide experience in child caring, every one of whom could pass a civil-service examination in the elementary principles of such work and in the customary methods of doing it.

For the past fifteen years people who deal with dependent children have thrashed this question out at the annual meetings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, and at many of the state and local conferences.

Inspection or supervision is advocated upon the following grounds: The prevention and correction of abuses, the check upon irresponsible power, the need of assurance of fitness for the work involved, the prescribing of rules for the conduct of the work, and the raising

of the general standard of efficiency, all of which imply concern for the welfare of the child, rather than concern for the protection of the public against imposition.

The objections to such inspection or supervision are all carefully qualified, and are based upon the fear of the possible political character of the state board charged with such duty, the danger attending the exercise of public authority by erratic individuals, and the fear of official fussiness and red tape.

We are all agreed as to the right and duty of the State to supervise institutions and societies which are in receipt of public funds. The question as to inspection of private agencies, which are supported entirely by private contributions, seems to resolve itself into one of practical utility. We are all agreed as to the splendid work which has been done by private agencies, such as children's aid societies, societies to prevent cruelty to children, and orphan asylums, but we might draw upon a common fund of experience for hundreds of instances of abuse, both by public and private agencies. It should be remembered that even a private institution, supported entirely by voluntary contributions, is in a certain sense the recipient of public funds. That is to say, if it is a charitable institution, its taxes are remitted, and it receives gratis the service which the rest of us have to buy with our taxes.

The exploitation of the child has not been entirely confined to those who would profit by its labor in industries. Societies have been formed by needy and seedy individuals which have traded in children for selfish ends, and the day of baby farming has not yet passed away. Even reputable societies have been known to farm boys out for night work in factories, and for employment in other occupations, such as racing, which are open to serious question from the standpoint of environment. We have even heard of some institutions which have developed their industries to such a successful point that the labor of the children has been an important consideration, and has led them to work the children long hours, under thoroughly unhealthy conditions. The children have been treated as though they were serving a sentence at hard labor. Of course, all of these are most exceptional cases, and yet I suppose that every man and woman who has had much experience in caring for dependent children has come in direct personal contact with some such case as I have described.

The home-finding and child-placing method of dealing with such children is now commonly accepted as the best method of dealing with them, because in a natural way it restores the children to their normal place as members of the human families, which are the units of our civilization. But it is a method which is peculiarly open to abuse and which needs the utmost care and watchfulness for its safeguards. I question the wisdom of handling dependent children through any national agency, or even through an agency which is doing an interstate business, unless it operates under state authority and direction in each State. Take the case of a society which in the course of ten years may scatter several thousand children through a territory covering an area of a thousand miles. Let us suppose that such a society, for financial or other reasons, should be discontinued. What happens to the children? Can it reinsure the human risks for which it is responsible with other agencies? If a receiver was ap-

pointed, would the receiver undertake to recognize the claims of these children for protection during their minority at the hands of the parent society? Would it be anybody's business to find out whether records of these children had been kept, and what was their present status? Do you not know of instances of this kind which have really constituted wholesale abandonment of dependent children by benevolent agencies? Or, again, take the case of societies which are organized for the protection of children against cruelty and abuse, and which, according to our careless custom, have been granted extraordinary police powers, and even magisterial authority. There is no question that such societies have done an enormous amount of good. Can we say that these powers are not at times abused, and should there not be some provision for the instant remedy of such abuse?

I could tell you of cases in which, under the operation of the fee system, agents of such a society have cooperated with a crooked justice of the peace and have made arrests and conducted prosecutions for the sake of the fees involved. Of course, inspection will not entirely prevent such abuses. We know that even in state institutions which are subject to inspection grave evils sometimes occur, but they do not go unchecked and the remedy for them is soon found. I think that a large part of the objections to public inspection of private institutions and agencies could be removed by a careful definition and limitation of the meaning of "inspection." When you talk of inspecting the work of such organizations, it may be interpreted to mean the actual visitation by the State of children who have been placed in families, which seems to me to be most unwise. What the State should do is to make sure that the children who are placed in families are visited and kept track of, so that the particular agency may have a constant record of the condition of each child. In the case of an institution, the inspection should be sufficient to satisfy the State as to the high character and conduct of the institution. The State should make sure that the buildings are sanitary, and that they are provided with proper fire escapes, and that the children are being comfortably fed and clothed, and given instruction in conformity with the school law. Personally, I believe that every child-caring agency should be chartered by the State, and under the terms of their charter the agencies should be required to make an intelligent annual report to the State. The State should have the right to suspend or abolish the charter after thorough investigation and a hearing, and the State should have the right to order such an investigation and compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses. At the same time the State's inspection should be carefully defined and limited, so that the evils and abuses of officialism could be avoided.

I don't think we need waste time in considering the question as to the right of the State to interfere on behalf of the child. The question is one of practical utility. If the advantages of State inspection are thoroughly demonstrated, reputable agencies, whether public or private, will be only too glad to get the benefit of it. After all, it is a case of the end justifying the means.

The CHAIRMAN. The secretary will now read topic No. 3.

The secretary read as follows:

Should the approval of the state board of charities (or other body exercising similar power) be necessary to the incorporation of all child-caring agencies and to an amend-

ment of the charter of an existing benevolent corporation if it is to include child-caring work; and should the care of children by other than incorporated agencies be forbidden?

The CHAIRMAN. The discussion of this subject will be opened by Hon. Robert W. Hebbard, for many years secretary of the state board of charities of New York and at present commissioner of charities of New York City. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. ROBERT W. HEBBERD, COMMISSIONER OF CHARITIES, NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. President and members of the conference, presumably I was chosen to open the discussion on this subject because New York State, through legislative enactment, settled these questions satisfactorily a good many years ago.

From time immemorial, it must be confessed, sordid individuals have for their own gain exploited dependent childhood. In our own State we have seen this spirit manifested both in the institutions for dependent children and in the placing movement. Sometimes it had led the offender to prison, even though he wore the garb of religion, and at other times it has hastened the departure of the culprit from our State, but unfortunately to other fields and pastures green, where he could repeat the offenses which made him notorious in the community which he left.

It was probably such cases as those of Crowley and Ramsar which gave us the stringent provisions of section 288 of the Penal Code, which in subdivision 2 prohibits the care of children under 12 years of age except by public officers or in duly incorporated or licensed institutions.

And this section in another subdivision further provides that no institution shall be incorporated for the care of such children except with the written consent of the supreme court, upon the certificate of approval in writing of the state board of charities.

The clearly proven vicious placing out of children, fully explained to the legislature in the reports of the state board of charities for 1896 and 1897, led to the enactment of chapter 264 of the laws of 1898, entitled "An act to prevent evils and abuses in the placing out of children," which makes it unlawful for any but incorporated societies or poor-law officers to place out children without the consent of the state board of charities.

By this same statute the state board is also given the duty of visiting children placed out, except by adoption, and empowered to prohibit persons and corporations who are carrying on placing-out work improperly from continuing such work thereafter.

If it is necessary to require the best citizens in our communities to secure charters with the approval of the state authorities to carry on banks and insurance companies having the care of finances, why should it not, in view of the issues involved, be even more important to require a duly approved charter for the care or the placing out of children, whose welfare should be regarded as more important than the care of money.

The principle must be clearly recognized that children bereft of home and parents are the children of the State, and that only through the action of the state legislature in the enactment of general or special laws can the lawful custody of such children be given to artifi-

cial parents, whether such parents be individuals or institutions. In other words, the natural rights which parents have in children can not be transferred, even with the consent of such parents, without such transfer is made in the manner directed by the State through statutory enactments.

This being so, it is clearly the function, and I believe a paramount duty of the state, to see that such children are cared for properly.

These laws have worked well in New York State. The old abuses have substantially disappeared and child-caring work is being carried on, whether it be in the form of institutional activities or in the placing out of children, on a higher plane and in a more progressive manner than ever before in the history of our State. The influence of the state board of charities in this respect has always been, and is now, far-reaching for good.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am confident that this question should be answered in the affirmative by this conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The discussion will be continued by Mr. Timothy D. Hurley, president of the Visitation and Aid Society, of Chicago. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. TIMOTHY D. HURLEY, PRESIDENT VISITATION AND AID SOCIETY, OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. HURLEY. I was a little misled by the title. As I take it, it is intended to mean all that it says, but to my mind it is a little too broad and too comprehensive. I think there is quite a distinction between child-caring and child-taking institutions. So I have drafted my paper on that line.

This is a broad, far-reaching subject. It is revolutionary in its scope. It attacks practically all of the private eleemosynary and church child-caring agencies not incorporated in our country. Notwithstanding the great scope of the subject, I think we should be prepared to take the stand that whenever a child becomes truant, neglected, dependent, or delinquent, within the meaning of the law, it is the duty of the state to insist that any person or association undertaking to exercise control over such a child should be subject to state supervision and control. All such associations should be incorporated and should be subject to such supervision and subject to like control.

This jurisdiction should be limited, however, to the above class of cases, and should not extend to private schools or orphan asylums which confine their work simply to furnishing education and maintenance for children placed in such institutions by their parents or guardians. So long as these latter institutions do not engage in home-placing work, they are not and should not be classed as child-caring institutions within the meaning of the present inquiry. A parent may be poor, and may, on account of sickness or other cause, see fit to temporarily place his child in an institution. This fact, however, does not make the child dependent, within the meaning of the law, and does not justify the state to interfere with parental control in such a case.

We should keep in mind at all times the prior right of the parent to exercise control over his child. Before the State can interfere with such control, it must find:

First, that such child is truant, neglected, dependent, or delinquent within the meaning of the law; and,

Second, that the parent or legal guardian is unfit to have the care and custody of his child, or has neglected and failed to properly care for and to provide for the child that training and education contemplated and required by both law and morals.

The State at the present time, where juvenile courts exist, exercises careful supervision over truant and delinquent children and all agencies dealing with such children.

In the case of truant children, they are committed to some person especially appointed by the court, and subject at all times to the direction and jurisdiction of the court, or to some institution that is maintained, at least in part, by public funds. Such an institution is at all times subject to the visitation of properly appointed committees, and especially by the court committing the child.

The delinquent child is likewise placed under the care and control of a person especially appointed by the court finding said child delinquent, or to some institution that is maintained at least in part by public funds and is subject at all times to visitation by court officials and other properly appointed and accredited committees.

A child being made a ward of the court because of the death of the parents, or other cause, and who is possessed of any property rights, is at all times subject to careful supervision by the court, who has jurisdiction of the child. Complete reports as to the condition of the child and its property are made from time to time by the court. The court usually acts through a guardian. His reports, including the disposition of the child, are at all times subject to the jurisdiction of the court.

So that we have only the neglected or dependent child who is not subject to state supervision under law. There is no good reason (keeping in mind all the time the prior right of the parent to exercise jurisdiction over his child) why, when the child is found dependent by the court, it should not be made ward of the court and be subject to the same careful supervision as is the truant and delinquent child, and the child that is possessed of property rights.

The law of Illinois at the present time provides, section 14, juvenile court law:

No association whose objects embrace the caring for dependent, neglected, or delinquent children shall hereafter be incorporated unless the proposed articles of incorporation shall first have been submitted to the examination of the board of state commissioners of public charities, and the secretary of state shall not issue a certificate of incorporation unless there shall first be filed in his office the certificate of said board of state commissioners of public charities that said board has examined the articles of incorporation and that in their judgment the incorporators are reputable and respectable persons, the proposed work is needed, and the incorporation of such an association is desirable and for the public good. Amendments to said articles of incorporation shall be subject to like scrutiny.

All corporations caring for dependent, neglected, and delinquent children, and which engage in home-placing work, should be required to obtain annually the approval of the state board of charities or some other state agency, certifying that they are accredited corporations for such work under the law.

All associations to which children are committed under the Illinois juvenile-court law must be so accredited before such commitments can be made.

The State, in the jurisdiction over dependent children, is not advancing a new thought or idea. It has, at all times, exercised jurisdiction over all such cases. The supreme court of Illinois in the noted case of *Cowles v. Cowles*, as early as 1846, wherein President Lincoln was counsel for the appellants, announced the law as follows:

The power of the court of chancery to interfere with and control not only the associates, but the person and custody of all minors within its jurisdiction is of very ancient origin, and can not now be questioned. * * * While the father so conducts himself as not to violate his rights, the court will not ordinarily interfere with his parental control. If, however, by his neglect or abuse, he shows himself not qualified to take charge of his offspring, the court may interfere and take the infant under its charge. (*Cowles v. Cowles*, 3 Gilman, 435.)

It will thus be seen that it is not necessary for the legislature to enlarge on the powers of the court of chancery in regard to the care of children. The legislature itself can not deprive the court of this power for the reason, as the same court announced in a subsequent case, that:

The performance of this duty (care of children) is justly regarded as one of the most important governmental functions, and all institutional limitations must be so understood and construed as not to interfere with its proper and legitimate exercise. (*County of McLean v. Humphrey*, 104 Ill.)

A court of equity (independent of statute) having inherent, original, and unlimited jurisdiction, can entertain jurisdiction in a proper case over any child alleged to be neglected. The court having obtained jurisdiction of the subject, the parents, custodian, and guardian may proceed to inquire into the alleged neglect of such child, and determine if the parent, legal guardian, or custodian is competent to control and govern said child, or has failed to provide said child the training and education contemplated as provided by law. In case the court finds the child neglected and that the parents are unable to control and govern said child, or have failed to provide the necessary training and education for said child, it can make said child a ward of the court, and thereafter enter such orders as for the best interests of said child. So long as the child remains a ward of the court the individual, guardian, or association having the care and custody of said child may be required to account for his guardianship.

It is quite clear that in an individual case properly before the court the court may and does exercise its general jurisdiction over such a child to an extent to protect the child from the harmful influences that may surround it. Such being the power of the court over individual cases, there does not seem to be any reason why the same power should not be extended over all children requiring the care and supervision of the court.

State supervision being once established, it will result in more accurate records being kept, more frequent visitation to the children, and a more friendly relation between institutions, the court, and the state officials.

Persons having control and management over institutions should not, in my opinion, oppose such state supervision. As a rule such oversight is generally helpful to the institutions. The institutions, as a rule, are supported by private contributions, and when these institutions are indorsed and accredited by public officials it gives them a standing at once before the community.

Again, every institution that is engaged in this general child-caring work should be willing at all times to submit their work to

a properly accredited committee for approval. We are all engaged in the same line of work, and there is no reason why we should not be able to agree on a proper method to pursue. As a general rule such oversight and supervision has proved helpful to institutions throughout the country.

In case the committee appointed under the law should exceed its power and authority, their action would be subject to review, and no doubt such a body would be called to account by the person or authority appointing them.

What we need in this country, above all other things, is for persons engaged in work that pertains to the State to come nearer and closer to the state officials. The state officials are anxious and willing at all times to honestly and conscientiously perform their duties and are open to suggestion and advice. We need have no fear from any properly accredited and authorized body.

The CHAIRMAN. Discussion upon topics Nos. 2 and 3 is now open to the conference.

REMARKS OF HON. MYRON T. HERRICK, OF CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Mr. HERRICK. Ladies and gentlemen, I am somewhat embarrassed in appearing before so many experts. My experience is largely the result of my connection with state institutions. I wish to say just a word on the question of inspection. In Ohio we have, I think, some 1,200 children in the institution at Lancaster, about 400 at the girls' home at Delaware, and approximately 900 at the Soldiers and Sailors' Orphans Home at Xenia. I feel that the value of inspection of these institutions, as well as of private institutions, can not be overestimated. Of course, in the end it is mainly a question of wise inspection, and the inspection should have power behind it. As a matter of fact, however, even if the power to correct the evils uncovered by inspection is lacking, public opinion will force a change.

I found the unexpected visiting of institutions to be an excellent practice. The result of such inspection is evidenced by improved conditions not only in the institutions visited but in others of like nature.

In my opinion it is of great value that the institutions not only be inspected, but that the work of the different institutions be compared in some way that will bring into prominence the merits and faults of each.

I also believe that these charitable institutions should be incorporated, and that they should be incorporated under the supervision of the state board of charities. Some of those interested in private institutions are fearful of the tendency of inspection by the State and of enforced incorporation under state laws. They are inclined to think that the fostering care of the State will remove the charitable impulse that prompts so many individuals to support private institutions. This is a danger that we must very carefully guard against. There are many private institutions that are doing a splendid work, and we must do nothing that will interfere in any way with their usefulness. The responsibility that now rests on the shoulders of the trustees of these institutions must not be shifted. So far as they are concerned the care of the State should be only for the purpose of offering suggestions and supplying needed information. The debt

of the country to the benevolent people behind private institutions is inestimable. We should permit nothing to interfere with the spirit that prompts the labor and self-sacrifice of these people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Mr. Meigs V. Crouse, superintendent Cincinnati Children's Home.

Mr. CROUSE. I would like to ask a question of Mr. Butler. Many of us are in sympathy with this matter of inspection of private institutions. I am speaking for one of them. The only thing that I apprehend is that which has been alluded to several times this afternoon, namely, the making of a public record of the foster homes into which the children have been placed. How do they manage it in Indiana? How do they keep that from becoming a matter of public information? How do they keep that confidential?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent, Mr. Butler may answer the question.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say that I can answer the inquiry in just a word—the law provides that the state board of charities may keep it secret.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Doctor McKenna, of New York.

REMARKS OF DR. CHARLES F. MCKENNA, SECRETARY CATHOLIC HOME BUREAU, NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. MCKENNA. It would seem like an act of gross disorder to drag from the end of the programme a question set down there and substitute it here, but I find that question 14 is at least a corollary of question 2, to which we are speaking, and question No. 3 also. Besides Mr. Fox has touched upon it. On that subject I would like, as a representative of a placing-out society, while recognizing fully and desiring strongly this inspection and control, to appeal to state boards of charities not to make the conditions of entrance into their States by the home-finding societies so onerous that it is practically impossible to place children in them. In one case it was stated that the infeasibility of the process required was purposely ordained so, to forbid placing out, which I think was not very honest. The prohibition in the law might have been plainly stated at once. This prohibition of placing out is ungenerous and not in accord with the spirit of our institutions or in accord with the spirit of reciprocity. It is very apt to produce some loss to the State itself which prescribes such a law.

One argument by the principal speaker to question No. 3 was that the necessity for such provisions of bonding arose from the situations which might come about that in the future the particular society placing that child might go out of business and it could not insure its risks. It is a question in my mind whether you could not transfer by a proper bond for the performance of the duty of the institution in the care of the child, if that did happen. On that principle there are many good works that would not be performed at all if we grew fearsome of what might happen if we died before we had completed what we started out to do.

I hope the committee on resolutions will find it wise to suggest to the state boards of charities to accept the findings of a conference like this and as far as possible to make their laws of a certain standard

and uniformity which will provide all the checks that are needed and yet that will not ordain that in a State where I could attach a locomotive to a car of dynamite and carry it through the State without the slightest check or oversight I can not bring in a car of lovely little children. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. I think the chair must not permit a further discussion of topic No. 14 at this time, because that is announced for discussion to-morrow.

Mr. HERRICK. Do you know whether it is the purpose to obtain the consensus of this meeting on these various topics by votes?

The CHAIRMAN. It was not the expectation of the committee on arrangements that there would be a vote until the committee on resolutions reports, which it will do at 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon, after which there will be time for a discussion of that report and action thereon.

I think we should continue the discussion of topic No. 3 specifically, and reserve topic No. 14 for further discussion to-morrow afternoon. Does anyone desire to speak further on topics Nos. 2 and 3? I will ask that hereafter the speakers limit their remarks to three minutes, if possible. The chair recognizes Mr. Montgomery, of Michigan.

REMARKS OF MR. JOHN BARRETT MONTGOMERY, SUPERINTENDENT MICHIGAN STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. As a representative of one of the largest child-placing agencies in this country, I consider it my duty to say just a word or two about the Michigan system of child-saving, which I have the honor to superintend.

The Michigan state public school has supervision at the present time of about 1,400 children, 200 of whom are in the institution, the remainder in family homes, and I firmly believe, as one speaker has already said, that the importance of close supervision of dependent children in family homes can not be overestimated, and would add that close supervision of public institutions and private charities which have for their purpose the placing of dependent children in family homes can not be overestimated. The Michigan state public school placed out in family homes during the past year over 500 children, and although the homes were selected with the greatest care possible, still about a third of the placements were transfers, which goes to show that no matter how careful the agency may be in its placement of children, only about two-thirds of them will find congenial homes the first time, and that close and intelligent supervision is required to adjust the other third to proper home conditions. The supervision of public institutions, children's homes, etc., is also of great importance to make sure that the children may find in them the necessary physical and intellectual care and training to fit them for normal home life and future citizenship.

I am pleased to say that Michigan has both home and institution supervision and under the laws for the government and control of the Michigan state public school, the Michigan system is a component part of the public-school system of the State, and under the supervision of the state superintendent of public instruction.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Mrs. Barrett, of Alexandria, Va.

REMARKS OF MRS. KATE WALLER BARRETT, GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT FLORENCE CRITTENTON MISSION.

Mrs. BARRETT. I want briefly to say a word in behalf of the inspection of private institutions which have the care of children. I represent 78 private institutions, all of which care for some children. If there is one thing that impresses me in my work with private institutions for caring for children, it is the need of state supervision. [Applause.] I come across the need of it almost every day of my life. Only the other day in a city not far from here, at 10 o'clock at night, the doorbell rang and when I answered it there stood on the step a little colored girl 13 years old. In her hands she held a pasteboard shoe box that contained all her earthly possessions. When I asked the history of the child, she told me that she had been in three private institutions for the care of children in that State. The State has a board of charities, but with no authority over private institutions; I believe not over even those that receive public money. I could not believe the story the child told me. The next morning I started out, with a friend of mine, not known to these various institutions, and I visited the three, and I found that the child's story was true. She had been placed in a half dozen homes. None of those who placed her had taken proper care or supervision of the child, and at the last home into which she was placed the people moved into the country and turned her out into the street, without any place to go, and she came to the Florence Crittenton Mission. I took the child in and we have had her now four or five months. Physically she was in a bad condition, but she has the making of a useful woman in her. All the lack of care and of training that she had had came about because of the inefficiency or the oversight of the institutions that had handled her.

Under proper state supervision I do not believe many such cases as that would be possible, and so I most earnestly plead with every man and woman in this audience—it does not matter how much it may cost you—to use your influence in behalf of state supervision of private institutions, particularly of private institutions that have child caring as their principal work. I want to make that appeal from the very bottom of my heart, because I have had so much experience lately with children who have been placed in homes by indifferent societies and have not had the proper supervision after having been so placed. A private institution has nothing to lose and everything to gain by public investigation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes Mr. Stahmann, of Missouri.

REMARKS OF REV. C. C. STAHMANN, STATE SUPERINTENDENT MISSOURI CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

Mr. STAHMANN. I come from a State that has no state supervision. We adjoin a State that has a splendid supervision, the State of Illinois, and we are frequently placed in contact with the workers in that State. I want to express my gratitude to this conference for the opportunity of considering this subject, and I trust that strong resolutions will be formed and passed here fixing this state supervision.

I represent a private charity, the Children's Home Society of Missouri, and I speak for this society and for many other societies along that line, that they would welcome just such state supervision.

Supervision would benefit our State from another viewpoint, namely, that the unscrupulous soliciting going on at the present time would be severely handicapped and charitably inclined people would no longer be imposed upon. The other day I was informed that in the city of St. Louis there is a kind of trust that solicits for charitable institutions. They have invited other persons to join them so that they can fix their price and carry on the method of fleecing people, as I call it, methodically; and if we have state supervision this matter will be regulated. Only such institutions as can bear the light will exist or continue to exist, and for that reason I am glad, I am thankful, that this subject has been brought up here this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Mrs. Schoff, of Philadelphia.

REMARKS OF MRS. FREDERIC SCHOFF, PRESIDENT NATIONAL CONGRESS OF MOTHERS.

Mrs. SCHOFF. I want to emphasize my appreciation of state supervision. It is a matter which has engaged our attention in Pennsylvania, where we have been working to get that supervision over our agencies. I am sure that the private institutions need supervision as well as the public institutions. We are expecting to introduce a bill in the legislature this winter in that direction.

I also want to make another point, which, it seems to me, is very important, in regard to juvenile courts, which are becoming universal. Their power has not yet been fully understood. We do not transfer land without making a record of it, and no child should be permanently transferred from his own home without making the transfer a matter of record to which reference could be made. Records should not be in a private society only. We should make it a law that all child-placing societies should go into the juvenile court and either get their sanction as to the placing of a child or make their report as to where the child is placed, so that in each county juvenile court there would be a record of the children placed, which could be used by people in looking them up in after years. Property interests and renewal of ties of blood make this necessary. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize Mr. Loomis, of Newark, N. J.

FRANK D. LOOMIS, GENERAL SECRETARY CHILDREN'S BUREAU, NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. LOOMIS. State inspection of child-caring agencies should be made for two reasons: First, in behalf of the welfare of the child who must be cared for, and, second, in behalf of the general social welfare as affected by the work of the child-caring agency.

It has frequently been found that child-caring societies keep children as if they were charitable wards when the parents themselves are abundantly able to provide for them. If such parents pay a dollar or two a month, it is represented that they are paying the board, although the actual cost per month for each child is usually \$10 or \$12. Thus homes are deliberately broken without justification, while the public pays the cost.

So long as the child remains in his own home the State supervises him in many ways which are discontinued if the child is removed to

an institution. For instance, while in the custody of his own natural parents the State requires that the child shall attend school regularly. But if the child is transferred to the custody of a child-caring agency the control of the State in that regard ceases. The institution can maintain almost any kind of a school and send the child according to its own convenience. It reports only to itself. Surely state supervision of the care of children should be exercised as carefully in behalf of the child as when he is in the custody of his own parents and in his natural home.

Moreover, in the placing out of children, children of the age of 10 or 11 years are frequently put in homes where they are never sent to school. In remote rural communities the state laws regarding education are not always enforced, and while a parent may send his own boys to school he keeps the strange boy at home to help with the chores; or girls of tender age have been placed with respected families in the best of cities where they are registered as servants and treated as such. They do not come under the supervision of the truant officer, because he has no way of knowing that they are there.

Certainly the welfare of the child and the welfare of the community are concerned in the inspection of all child-caring agencies. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Rabbi Hirsch, of Illinois.

REMARKS OF RABBI EMIL G. HIRSCH, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHARITIES OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. HIRSCH. Speaking for the Illinois state board of charities, and entirely from that point of view, I want to indorse what Mr. Butler said in his paper. That is an accurate photograph of our own experience, and I earnestly indorse all that he has said and all of his recommendations. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Unless some one especially desires to speak the chair is disposed to call for the next topic. The last topic for discussion to-day is of a somewhat different character. Will the secretary kindly read topic No. 8?

The secretary read as follows:

Should child-caring agencies aim to cooperate with each other, and with other agencies of social betterments for the purpose of diminishing or removing altogether the causes of orphanage or child destitution, and child delinquency?

The CHAIRMAN. Before calling on the next speaker I wish to give notice to Judge De Lacy that I am going to ask him to participate in this discussion.

The discussion of this topic will be opened by Doctor Henderson, whom you all know. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF PROF. CHARLES B. HENDERSON, PH. D., PRESIDENT NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, as has been intimated already by Mr. Folks, we enter, in the discussion of the eighth topic, on a question which opens up an entirely different field. We have been discussing the child-caring agencies, both public and private; we have considered the state, the municipal, and the private institutions for caring for children who are dependent, neglected, defective, and delinquent. We enter now upon an entirely different

phase of the question, the means of preventing orphanage and of preventing the child from growing up in bad surroundings through ignorance and neglect.

Private charity and public charity can do a great deal to relieve distress which has already occurred; but our friend Doctor Devine has pointed out in his *Principles of Relief* a very important consideration, that charity at its best, in its most splendid forms, in its greatest and largest sweep, cares only for exceptional cases. If it were otherwise, society would sink beneath the burden which is imposed upon it by the miseries of those who have been neglected and who need social help.

The time when every effort will count for the most is before the orphanage has occurred. The studies of investigators both abroad and in this country show that orphanage, dependence, and delinquency are due to causes which can not be touched by any form of charity known in modern society. It is indeed true that we can go into the homes and help them. It is a good thing for us, as we have discussed this afternoon, to help the poor mother to perform the best service she can render to society. If it is necessary to have help, then let us not, as in some of the States is done, permit some of the little children to go into factories and to work themselves to death in order to help support the family. The family must be supported, the mother must be cared for, but not at the cost of the children. Nor, on the other side, shall the children be supported at the cost of the mother's life. She can be engaged in better work, it may be, than in scrubbing, or some such task, which the charitable society may secure for her. It may be that her best service for society, as well as to the children, is in that employment in which she alone can render the best help to life, that is, in the care of the children that she has brought into the world. But private charity can not help adequately. It is true that charity is not useless. The dirty back yards can be transformed into paradises of roses. In many instances home ambition can be inspired by loving and faithful service. The function of the private charity, whether an institution or a placing-out society, is not to take the place of the general movement of society, but to supplement it and to assist where it fails. That is all it can do.

Two causes of domestic ruin are disease and accident. The child breaks down because the home has suffered, and the home is spoiled very often as the consequence of causes which charity can not relieve and can not touch. For example, we must care for children who inherit physical defects, we must care for children who are in families where the income is insufficient. Is that enough? When we have reported upon the immediate condition, have we done our full duty as probation officers of the juvenile court, as friendly visitors in the home, as charity workers? Are we not, before all others, responsible to the community? Is it not our duty to go back to the owners of great industries, manufactures, mines, the commercial interests of the land, and say: "You have thrown upon us the result of disease, and you have no right to do it; you have thrown upon us and our institutions the result of accidents that might have been prevented [applause]; you have thrown upon us the result of neglect?"

In no important country in the civilized world, except in our own beloved country, can it be said that when the working man has been worn out by industry, or by disease and injury incident to his occupa-

tion, that he and his family, or his orphan children, must bear the whole brunt and burden of that loss and of that neglect.

For myself—and I believe when you have thought it out you will say with me, every one of you, every man and woman—I say that that is a disgrace to our nation, that is a shame, and so far as we are concerned at this conference it shall go no longer without our most earnest and unanimous protest. [Applause.]

The great man whom we admire apart from all political and partisan considerations, and who has just called us together, has again and again spoken upon this subject, calling the attention of Congress, of the legislators, of citizens everywhere, to these—shall I speak of them as I feel?—to these infamies of our American civilization. It is simply because we have not thought about it that they continue. There is “evil wrought by want of thought as well as by want of heart,” and if it is the business of anyone to speak on behalf of the removal of the causes of orphanage, the causes of neglect, the causes of disease, the causes of the breaking down of family life in this country, it is those like ourselves, who day by day in our different walks in charity service have made these discoveries. They have rolled in upon us like an ocean flood, and we are trying to deal with them as well as we can. In the institutional work, in doling out baskets full of food, in visiting homes of distress with relief, we are doing all we can; but it is too late. It is too late. Many of the accidents, many of the cases of disease on the part of the father and mother, might have been prevented if in our trades we had had as good protection laws in regard to these matters as they have in some countries. Many of these cases of orphanage and of neglect might never have been thrown upon our charity if we had laws of compensation or insurance equal to the best. They say we can not do as they do in Germany, we can not do as they have already done in France, we can not do as they have done even in England. But I say that we, the richest of them all, may not do as they do. I am not asking for a slavish imitation of their methods of protecting the family before the calamity has fallen with its deadly weight. We want something different from that. When we, a nation with larger wealth and with wealth more rapidly growing than that of any other nation, come to recognize our responsibilities we shall not do like Germany, we shall not do like England or France. We shall do vastly better. Much more splendid things we will do.

There are many other things we might do, forms of cooperation we might speak of locally in the State and in the nation. We have come together not merely to tinker with the evils that have fallen on us; not merely to deal with the symptoms that are manifest upon the surface. The topic which has been proposed for me requires me to call to your attention—and in your faces I find the most hearty response—the remoter causes, to means of changing the conditions about us; conditions which are guilty of the blood of the children, guilty of causing the tears of the mother and of the widow; we are to lay the responsibility on the commerce and industry of our country, which is fully able and, I believe, willing to carry it. When the matter is brought home to them the merchant princes and the captains of our industry will be among the first, not only to do what the law requires, but as you will find in England, France, and Germany, even more than the law can require. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The next speaker on this subject is Hon. Thomas W. Hynes, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS W. HYNES, PRESIDENT SUPERIOR COUNCIL ST. VINCENT DE PAUL SOCIETY, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Mr. HYNES. I wish to make an explanation. Until I arrived here this afternoon I was not aware that I was still expected to speak on this subject, and so I feel that I owe it to this audience and to myself to make this apology. While sitting here I have been trying to collect a few thoughts.

The question of cooperation among child-caring agencies is one that is very difficult to treat. To save children in their homes is a most laudable and praiseworthy aim. That is the object, or, at least, should be the object, of every society that has the interests of children at heart. Wherever possible, I believe, that is being done; but in many cases, as is well known, it is not possible at present so to do.

Cooperation could be, and should be, employed by all societies in the reporting of cases of destitution among children to sister societies. Some means might be suggested by which employment could be obtained for the head of a destitute family, or temporary aid loaned where needed to bridge over immediate want, so that the members of such a family might be kept in their own home.

The question of removing altogether the causes of orphanage is of course beyond the power of man to solve. This goes to the more complex question of the uncertainty of life. Many parents of young children are called from this life. We can not fathom the reason for this, but believe it the act of an all-wise Providence. No power on earth can prevent this, as we know.

When the children in such cases are not taken in charge by relatives, then the city or one of the many societies organized for that purpose should provide a place for them, and in fairness to the children, as well as to the memory of the deceased parents, that home or institution should be one under the care of those of the same religious belief as that of the parents and in which the children have been trained; they to remain in that home or institution until a proper private home can be provided.

Many societies are doing noble work among the poor, aiding them in retaining their homes; and I am a strong advocate of the principle that the homes of the poor should not be broken up until all hope of keeping the family together be lost; and that weaknesses on the part of either parent, when not entirely vicious or criminal, should not be an excuse for withholding aid.

One suggestion that has often come to my mind is that where the father of a family criminally refuses to support those dependent upon him, or deserts his wife and children, such head of family should be committed to a penal institution and bound to labor, the proceeds of such labor to be paid over to the dependent wife and children, instead of, as now, giving the benefit of such labor to the State, while the family is left destitute. This is a movement which, I believe, should have the support of all child-caring agencies, so that through their cooperation a measure having this object in view might be obtained through the aid of the state legislatures. Such a measure would in many cases be a cure for destitution.

With that in mind, the state commission of prisons of New York State (of which until recently I had the honor of being a member) has taken steps to have such a recommendation brought to the attention of Governor Hughes.

As to the question of child delinquency, I think it is generally agreed that the lack of moral training in some of our schools and in many of our homes is responsible for most of the lapses among the young. Poverty, of course, plays a large part in this also, as the children are compelled to go to work at a very early age and before they are either mentally or physically equipped for the struggle of life, and naturally they fall by the wayside. The matter of rent forces poor families to live in apartments too small for their needs, which results in the children (the boys, at any rate) being obliged to spend most of their leisure time on the streets, and too often they get into bad company and thus find their way to the courts.

I do not suppose that such a conference as this can do much more than direct public attention to the importance of this child-caring question; but I trust that those interested will take such measures in their own localities as the particular problems that they have to meet require.

The CHAIRMAN. On behalf of the committee on arrangements, I desire to say that while at first sight it might seem a little ambitious for us to attempt to control the causes of orphanage, that is not an impossibility. For instance, if we could push to a successful conclusion the campaign for the prevention of tuberculosis, we should have diminished the number of orphans and half orphans in our institutions in some cities by 52 per cent. That is one sort of orphanage which we thought might be brought in some degree under control.

I shall ask Judge De Lacy if he will kindly take part in the discussion of this subject. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM H. DE LACY, JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Judge DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen. In making an explanation in behalf of the committee the chairman has stated somewhat the argument that I would have advanced for leaving the proposition in its present phraseology. It is a very good thing for orphan asylums and other child-caring agencies to cooperate with any movement that will prevent orphanage (and I use the term advisedly) that will prevent child destitution, that will prevent child delinquency.

When called to my feet a few minutes ago I had occasion to refer to the fact that in our Declaration of Independence we stated that everyone had certain inalienable rights—the right to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. Further, we state in that famed document, that for the conservation of these rights governments have been established, and that, when the government failed to perform its duty in this regard it was the right of society to displace the government and place a more efficient one in its stead.

It is therefore the supreme concern of the state to preserve the lives of its citizens. As has been so well said and so eloquently said by the scholarly Doctor Henderson, we do not do our duty by our fellow-members in the community, unless we look back and discover the real cause of orphanage and do, as far as it lies in the power of the

state, to remove them. There are a great many troubles and a great many complaints laid at the door of Providence of which Providence is entirely guiltless. [Applause.]

Now, as your chairman has very well said, those who have to do with the large questions of caring for the child, should ally themselves with the tuberculosis movement, and so I would add any other movement that looks to the conservation of life—the sanitary housing movement, for instance. They should lend themselves to any campaign of education that would show the fallacy of our present policy of free contract. Think of talking of a free contract between the head of a factory with a million dollars in bank and the poor girl who is going into the factory to earn her week's wage! They are not on a level. She must go in that place because there is no other in which she can earn her daily bread. She must go there whether or not the management of the factory disregards the laws for the safeguarding of machinery so that she by her skirts will not be carried into the rapid revolutions of the machinery and her limb torn off, or perhaps her life crushed out. A very young girl was brought into the court begging on the street because her father had been blinded and incapacitated by an accident in the mines.

It seems to me it is a very important matter for us who are deeply interested in the child, to safeguard those who are the child's real wealth, its real embodiment of value—its parents, or its other bread-winners. We must make laws that recognize that the child has rights to its parents, to its benefactors.

Now, I will leave the matter of child destitution for the last and say a word regarding the importance of the institutions, of child-placing agencies, and of probation officers and juvenile court agents generally, allying themselves, as to a preventive measure, to the campaign for the institution of playgrounds. Certainly playgrounds should be more widely distributed throughout our cities, in which in order that life may be carried on properly, a great many laws and regulations become necessary that are unknown in country districts, and a great many limitations are placed upon children that render the children all the more liable to violate the law, and, consequently, to be brought into the juvenile courts. If we are going to take the children off the streets to prevent them from playing ball in the streets and engaging in other childish pastimes that are but the expression of their God-given activity and energy, then I say in the name of common justice we must afford them opportunity to carry on these activities in the playgrounds.

Further than that, we have not gone far enough in the matter of the prevention of child delinquency until we follow our friends across the water, the Germans, in the establishment of trade schools, so that the youths between fourteen and twenty-one will have placed at their disposal an opportunity to learn a trade and to learn to use their energies for the good of their fellows, and, consequently, for their own prosperity and well-being. [Applause.]

Now, just a word about child destitution. I want to say that here in the District of Columbia we are working as far as in us lies to remove child destitution which arises by the failure of the father of a family to do his duty. We have here a law making it a misdemeanor for a father to fail to support his wife or children without just cause. It is made a misdemeanor, and it is punishable by a fine as

much as \$500, or imprisonment at hard labor in the workhouse for a period of one year, or both, and the court is empowered to direct that the fine or a part of it be given to the family, or, if the man be committed to the workhouse, that 50 cents a day be paid to his family for each day that he works there. I want to say that that is an admirable law, and I want to say if the children are fed in the home they are less likely to go into the streets to beg or steal or otherwise violate the law. We have to-day on the relief roll of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia over 400 families that would otherwise be a burden on the taxpayers of this District. In the last fiscal year we had 663 of these cases; 590 were placed on probation, and it became necessary to send only 73 to the workhouse, and most of those 73 were chronic drunks, and every such one got a six months' sentence.

And I want to call your attention to the fact that after a month has been spent within the kindly walls of that institution, where they go to bed regularly and get up regularly and get three meals a day regularly and they have the discipline of daily curative work, if they have come to the conclusion that it is best for them to try to take care of their families and to fulfill the obligations to the woman that they incurred when they made the marriage vows voluntarily at the altar, and they write me a letter to this effect, I consent to their making some sort of an arrangement so that they can be paroled and return to their families just as the 590 placed on probation. They take the pledge, if a cause has been the drink habit, or, if another woman, that they promise to leave her alone. Further than that, each is required on Saturday night to go to the desk sergeant of the precinct in which he lives and pay there a stipulated sum, and he is made to understand that when he goes to the desk sergeant that officer will observe whether or not he is doing what he should and will let me know. So that if he fails to keep his promise I will know it. This stipulated sum goes to the family without any deduction for costs. Under that practice \$21,888.56 were paid last year to dependent families. [Applause.]

I want to say that in the development of this work of trying to prevent child destitution, we have used the police force of the city, the men who are down among the people everywhere, and there is no greater or more widespread factor for social betterment in the community than the policeman [Applause]; and I have the sympathetic aid of every man who wears the shield in the city of Washington in the enforcement of the nonsupport law. They are doing noble work in this behalf.

I do not want to take your time any longer, but I just wanted to advance a few reasons to show why orphan asylums, why child-placing institutions, why, in a word, everybody seeking to aid the child, should not only do his own particular work, but should come up into the great open and join hands with the vast brotherhood, endeavoring to build up our people, our citizenship, and our country under the guidance of that noblest and best example of American citizenship, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Father White, supervisor of Catholic charities, of Brooklyn. I think that after Father White has spoken I will return to the three-minute rule.

REMARKS OF REV. WILLIAM J. WHITE, D. D., SUPERVISOR OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES, OF BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Doctor WHITE. I want to say that I agree most cordially with the remarks made by Professor Henderson, and am perfectly willing to agree to the suspension of the rule regarding the time limit. In every community there are men who are public-spirited citizens, engaged in work for the advancement of the community, acting as managers of institutions having the care of dependent children, who are at the same time in their private capacity as employers of labor paying less than a living wage, and are, therefore, responsible for a good many of these children getting into these institutions. [Applause.]

This is not always the fault of the individual. It is the fault, sometimes, of an undeveloped social conscience. It is the fault, in a great degree, of the system. I suppose it sounds ridiculous to some to say that organized labor is an agency for social betterment, and yet I think when we come to realize the work of organized labor in building up a standard of living, we will understand that it helps to keep the children out of these institutions. [Applause.]

As a matter of fact, in the industrial depression through which we have just passed, I found that the men who went to the wall quickest, the men who were compelled to break up their homes after one or two weeks of lack of work, were unskilled laborers; and the men who were able to hold out and keep their families together were those who belonged to the union and had something laid by for a rainy day. So I think we are not altogether out of place in encouraging organized labor. I do not mean to go so far as to ask our indorsement of all the methods of organized labor, but in an individual capacity we can recognize the fact that a living wage ought to be paid, and we should recognize the power of organized labor in helping to see that it is paid. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Commissioner Neill, the Commissioner of Labor of the United States.

REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES P. NEILL, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF LABOR.

Mr. NEILL. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, since the topic now under consideration is not again to be brought up in this discussion, I want to take advantage of these moments merely to emphasize a point that Professor Henderson very strikingly brought out in his address and to which Father White has also called attention.

There is one cause of dependency which could to such a large degree be eliminated and the existence of which is such a glaring and discreditable example of social injustice that I think charity workers everywhere should earnestly cooperate with the other forces that are now endeavoring to remove this cause. I refer to the numerous cases of dependency that occur every year as the result of industrial accidents. Day after day, month after month, and year after year, our high-pressure industrial system goes on, steadily maiming and killing its victims, so that the figures annually mount up into the thousands. Many of those killed or permanently disabled are comparatively young men, who were working for so small a wage that they have been unable to make any adequate provision

for their families, or, in case of death, for the widows and orphans they leave behind, and in the case of the younger men especially, the orphans are likely to be children of tender years, who for a considerable time to come will be unable to do anything for the support of themselves or their widowed mothers. The fact that the wife and children of any self-respecting and self-supporting wage-earner, whose life is offered up as part of the inevitable sacrifice that industry, even under the best conditions, necessarily entails, should become an object of charity, should be a source of shame to the community that permits it, and it is a sad commentary on our industrial institutions. Even as these innocent victims accept your charity, they have the right to feel that they are the victims of an injustice, and that our method of relieving them is literally adding insult to injury.

There should be laws in every State of the Union that would compel each industry itself to provide for these human losses and to pay adequate compensation to the wives and children of its victims. As Professor Henderson has said, the United States has the unenviable distinction of being the one industrial country in the civilized world in which the care of a family left without a breadwinner through industrial accident could arise as a problem of charity. Every other industrial country has made provisions in its laws by which compensation is paid to such families as a right and not as a charity. At every European conference dealing with the question of employers' liability and compensation to the families of injured workmen, the delegates point to the United States as the one striking example of a nation shamefully backward in this respect.

This topic is particularly ripe for discussion at this time, as in several States in the Union it is being very seriously discussed, and bills for remedying the existing conditions have been or will be in a very short time introduced into the legislatures of a number of States. The present, therefore, seems a very opportune time for all those engaged in any charitable work to cooperate in the various States with all other organizations that are struggling for any form of liability or compensation act that will help to eliminate this frequent cause of dependency and at the same time remove a cause of reproach that all other countries have already blotted out.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Mrs. Macfarland of the Board of Children's Guardians of the District of Columbia.

REMARKS OF MRS. H. B. F. MACFARLAND, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mrs. MACFARLAND. I think, Mr. Chairman, that there is an orphanage which is very much sadder than that which comes to children who are deprived of their parents by death in its ordinary forms or by accident, and that is the orphanage of the child who is unlawfully born. In the Board of Children's Guardians since we began our work—and Congress created us fifteen years ago—we have had great numbers of illegitimate children to care for, so that it is a very serious economic question. During a recent board meeting a motion was brought forward and passed and sent to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia asking them that they request of Congress legislation making it a crime to become the parent of an unlawfully born child in the District of Columbia.

I think when we are considering questions of orphanage and means of removing its causes, that we would do well to go right back to the beginning and consider this. Ought it not to be made a crime in every State in the United States to bring a child into the world unlawfully born? Life is hard enough at the very best for the average person, and when a child comes into the world handicapped in this way it is almost impossible to rise above it. I do hope the conference will express itself on this line. [Applause.]

To become the parent of an illegitimate child is a crime, one of the worst and most far reaching of crimes, and the law ought to declare it a crime, and provide for its punishment even though there may be difficulties of doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Professor Thurston, of Illinois.

REMARKS OF MR. HENRY W. THURSTON, CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER JUVENILE COURT, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. THURSTON. Just one point in relation to child delinquency. Judge De Lacy and others have spoken of the playgrounds and of positive means of activity for the children, and I would like to call attention to the practice in our city of so many men and women simply contributing for the purposes of profit and gain to the passions of children and elder people. [Applause.] Now, whatever might be our ideas as to laws respecting elder people, we are all agreed that men and women who, simply for the purposes of gain, pander to the passions of children should be relentlessly prosecuted. Therefore it is that in Chicago and in some other cities the juvenile protective league work is the most hopeful phase, in addition to this playground work and to other positive activities in child-delinquency problems. I hope before this conference is over that Mrs. Bowen, who is in the conference, will tell you something of the work of the Juvenile Protective League in Chicago.

I simply want to make the point here that we are cooperating and we must see to it that, so far as all these conditions which make the child delinquent, not only by ones, but by dozens, are removed from every community. In Chicago 1,000,000 postal cards were destroyed by our protective league that never ought to have been printed at all, and anyone who knows the effect of these vile cards upon children will just take this as an illustration of the men and women who lead boys and girls astray, and all that sort of thing—you can fill out the picture. It is not necessary for me to tell you. That is not a dream, so far as the children are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Mr. George W. Wilder.

REMARKS OF MR. GEORGE W. WILDER, PRESIDENT NATIONAL CHILD-RESCUE LEAGUE.

Mr. WILDER. I feel a little hesitancy in addressing this body, as I have so little knowledge of some of these questions. But being one of "those employers with a million behind them, and having empty-handed employees coming for work," I want to say something that I think this conference ought to do: That everybody in this conference ought to use their individual influence for, and that is, as we boys used to say, "push over the plate," the employer's liability law.

I want to show this conference exactly what that means. Mind you, in the plant I represent we have a million dollars' worth of machinery that may injure somebody to-morrow. But I say put this employer's liability right up to the employers. I do not make any complaint about that, for I make you pay for the cost to me. Put it right up to the employer to pay anybody who is injured, the pay to commence after the injury, and let the State say what it shall be. Then what will the employer do? He will insure himself in an insurance company. But the insurance company will not insure him unless he puts every protective device possible on his machinery. Thus you get the protective devices and the employer pays a certain amount to the insurance company. He puts that tax onto the consumers of his goods, of course—I am a business man. [Laughter.]

I want to say that if you put it right up to the railroads of this country that when a man is killed or injured they shall not have the opportunity of holding him up in the courts of law for four and five and six years, leaving him nothing after the finish; that they shall not be given that chance; if you make the law say pay, and pay now, there will be less bankings washed away; there will be less grade crossings; there will be simply money paid to insurance companies; there will be simply money paid out by the insurance companies to those that are injured; there will be more protective devices, and there will be much less injury. And you all will pay in your freight bills.

I am talking to you as a practical business man on a subject that is the worst outrage in this country to-day in the causing of orphanage. That is the message I want to bring out on this point to every man here, and I say it as an employer. We should have an employer's liability law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Unless it is desired to continue the discussion I think the chair will now declare the discussion on this topic closed.

The President, in opening the meeting this afternoon, referred to the matter of the care of crippled children. A friend of the President, with his approval, has consented to prepare a very brief paper expressing the experience of a long connection with that particular subject. I would like to ask Doctor Shaffer if he will be good enough to speak to us for five minutes on the question of the care of crippled children.

ADDRESS BY NEWTON M. SHAFFER, M. D., PROFESSOR OF ORTHOPEDIC SURGERY, CORNELL UNIVERSITY MEDICAL COLLEGE, NEW YORK, AND SURGEON IN CHIEF TO THE NEW YORK STATE HOSPITAL FOR THE CARE OF CRIPPLED AND DEFORMED CHILDREN.

THE CARE AND TREATMENT OF THE DEPENDENT AND NEGLECTED CRIPPLED AND DEFORMED CHILDREN.

Doctor SHAFFER. The subject I wish especially to bring to the attention of this conference is that which involves the care of the destitute or neglected crippled or deformed child.

All that may be or has been said in the circular letter addressed by the committee to President Roosevelt may be repeated here with great emphasis regarding those for whom I appeal, and of whom it

may also be said that they must under the circumstances form a class by themselves. Their disabilities and sufferings make them ineligible to ordinary care, or to the more or less inflexible rules that may be formed and followed for the normal destitute child, and whose condition, be it disease or simply deformity, calls for definite work and permanent relief on the part of those who will work under the guidance or advice of this conference.

Statistics which would be of great importance in considering this matter are unfortunately not available. It may be stated, however, that there are many thousands of this class in every State in the Union. Of these there are a good proportion who are neglected and many who are hopelessly dependent.

When it was proposed to establish the New York State Hospital for the care of crippled and deformed children in 1899, the state board of charities prepared a census of the institutions under their jurisdiction, and among the inmates there were found in the almshouses, etc., over one hundred deformed children who were receiving no care, whose condition was in every way neglected, and who were and would continue to be until their death a burden upon the State. Add to this the suffering and deformed children of the poor mechanic, the poverty stricken widow, the struggling seamstress, and others, and the neglected and destitute children of this class becomes very much enlarged. The destitute, crippled, and deformed children may be roughly divided into two classes: First, those whose deformities arise from some diseased condition, like tuberculous disease of the joints or spine, and, second, those afflicted with some deforming condition not accompanied by active disease like the deformities arising from infantile paralysis, knock-knee, club foot, etc. The former require, as a rule, special surgical care not always afforded by the dispensaries and schools established for their relief, and many who ought, especially if they have abscesses, to be more or less isolated; while the latter need, after a comparatively short hospital care, mechanical supports, which under ordinary circumstances enable those afflicted ones to get about with comparative ease.

I think it will be admitted that the larger portion of this dependent class need hospital care for a prolonged period. For instance, the average duration of treatment for both classes of cases above referred to at the New York State Hospital for the care of crippled and deformed children at West Haverstraw, N. Y., is one year, six months, and twenty-seven days; for the tuberculosis cases it is about three years, and this question of prolonged hospital care brings up the secondary one of environment and education.

Luckily, this class of dependents, eliminating those whose deformities are due to a cerebral lesion, have as a rule excellent brains, oftentimes they are exceptionally bright, and most fortunately the hands and arms are not often affected. The question of both mental and manual training is therefore quite easily solved, and a careful consideration as to the proper course for each child should be studied before a selection is made. Telegraphy, stenography, typewriting, plain and ornamental sewing, etc., suggest themselves as being appropriate occupations for the brighter minds, and for the girls especially; while carpentry, shoemaking, cane seating, etc., for some but not all of the boys. In any event, all should be well grounded in the elementary branches of education.

Their environment should include as nearly as possible the home life. The bringing together of a large number of children, especially of this class, should be discouraged. The family of destitute, crippled and deformed children should not exceed, in my judgment, more than forty and great care should be exercised in the selection of those in control.

This has been the policy of the state hospital at West Haverstraw with a limited number, only about forty-five under care, and with many of them too ill to pursue the regular industrial training course, and with much time and effort given to the fresh-air treatment of tuberculous patients. No class could be formed large enough to warrant the employment of a special teacher for manual training, but there is a teacher employed under the civil service rules to instruct all those able to attend school and gives, so far as possible, graduated instruction. In addition to this the various officers of the institution have voluntarily given instruction in the branches above named. There are other excellent institutions and schools of hospitals where good work is being done in this direction, and of which time will not permit me to speak on this occasion. My final plea in institution work of this class is to recognize the hospital work first, to put the patients in a condition where they are competent to receive both manual and mental training before the question, especially of manual industrial education, is made prominent in the work.

The secretary made an announcement concerning the attendance at the public meeting scheduled for the New Willard Hotel at 8 p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. I desire to call attention to the fact that tomorrow's sessions will be held in the District Building, one at half-past 9 o'clock in the morning, and the other at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

(Thereupon, at 5.30 o'clock p. m. the conference adjourned until Tuesday, January 26, at 9.30 o'clock a. m.)

**PUBLIC SESSION AT NEW WILLARD HOTEL, 8 O'CLOCK, MONDAY,
JANUARY 25, 1909.**

Presiding officer: Hon. Thomas M. Mulry, vice-chairman of conference, president of the Superior Council, Society of St. Vincent de Paul.

Secretary: James E. West.

RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

Hon. William H. De Lacy, *chairman*.

Hon. Elmer E. Brown.
Mr. P. J. Brennan.
Mr. William Knowles Cooper.
Mr. William F. Downey.
Mr. John Joy Edson.
Mr. Thomas K. Gallaher.
Mr. Edward J. Hannan.
Rev. Joseph J. Himmel, S. J.
George M. Kober, M. D.
Mr. B. Pickman Mann.
Mrs. H. B. F. Macfarland.
Hon. Geo. W. Needham.
Mrs. Ellen Spencer Mussey.
Rev. Dr. William T. Russell.

Mr. E. Francis Riggs.
Hon. James Bronson Reynolds.
Rev. Dr. Abram Simon.
Rabbi Louis Stern.
Rev. Wilbur P. Thirkield.
Mrs. S. W. Woodward.
Hon. Simon Wolf.
Rev. Dr. William J. Kerby.
Mr. S. W. Woodward.
Mr. James D. Mankin.
Rt. Rev. Dennis J. O'Connell.
Mr. Thomas H. Callan.
Mr. Thomas C. Noyes.
Mr. Cuno H. Rudolph.

GENERAL SUBJECT: TOPICS NOS. 4 AND 5.

4. Should children of parents of worthy character but suffering from temporary misfortune, and the children of widows of worthy character and reasonable efficiency, be kept with their parents—aid being given the parents to enable them to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children? Should the breaking of a home be permitted for reasons of poverty or only for reasons of inefficiency or immorality?

5. Should children normal in mind and body and not requiring special training, who must be removed from their own homes, be cared for in families wherever practicable?

"A word of greeting from the District of Columbia," Hon. H. B. F. Macfarland, President Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"The home versus the institution," by Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch, President of the National Conference of Jewish Charities.

"Family Influence," by Rt. Rev. D. J. McMahon, Supervisor of Catholic Charities, Archdiocese of New York.

"Modern Devices for Minimizing Dependency," by Miss Jane Addams, President, Hull House, Chicago.

"Preservation of the Family Home," by Mr. David F. Tilley, Member State Board of Charities of Massachusetts.

"The Evolution of Child Placing," by Dr. Hastings H. Hart, Chairman Study of Child Placing, Russell Sage Foundation.

"Destitute Colored Children of the South," by Dr. Booker T. Washington, President Tuskegee Institute.

The conference was called to order by Thomas M. Mulry, in the large ballroom of the New Willard Hotel, at 8 o'clock p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that we find such a large attendance (nearly 1,600) here this evening, in the continuation of the very enthusiastic meeting we had this afternoon. Owing to the number of addresses there will be no debate this evening, and we have also been compelled to confine the speakers to fifteen minutes so as to give a chance to all to say something. It is hardly necessary for me to say very much on this occasion. I think

it is always wise for a chairman to say very little, and therefore in introducing the speakers this evening I will not give way to the temptation, which frequently comes upon a chairman, to give a sort of biography of those he introduces.

The President has sounded the keynote of this conference when he said, in the few remarks he made to-day, that he was in favor of evolution and not revolution. That is why the people and the societies engaged in charitable work have gathered to-day in a convention which, this afternoon, was nothing short of a love feast, and which we expect will be so continued to-night. We realize that in every branch of child-saving work there is some good, and that in every branch there is probably some defect; and therefore the object of the meeting which we will have is to adopt the good and eliminate the bad, and to make it into one great whole which will be for the benefit of the child, and that is the reason for our meeting. [Applause.]

With these words I will now proceed with the business of the meeting. It gives me great pleasure to present to you Hon. H. B. F. Macfarland, President Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who will extend the greetings of the people of the District of Columbia.

ADDRESS OF HON. H. B. F. MACFARLAND, PRESIDENT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MACFARLAND. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: The President of the United States has done many notable things, many things which have benefited our country, but he has done no more notable thing, and he has done nothing which will more benefit our country, than he accomplished when he convened you in this conference, which, as the chairman of the evening has just stated, is already notable for its charity. But charity is not always found among those who are interested in charity. Indeed, the war between philanthropies is sometimes discouraging; so that it is delightful to see these brethren and these sisters dwelling here together in unity, and to see that harmony, that charity, and that love which is the translation of charity appearing in these proceedings.

Last April I sat in the White House East Room as the representative of the District of Columbia in the White House conference on the conservation of our natural resources. As I sat in the East Room to-day as a member of this conference, I thought that the President had brought together this time a conference on the conservation of the greatest of our natural resources.

We of the national capital, the government of the national capital, wish you to know how highly we appreciate the honor of your presence and the significance of your coming together, and the result which we have a right to expect from your deliberations, which will profit us, will profit our country, and will profit our time.

We, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, its executive government, are particularly happy that we are able to offer you the hospitality of our new District government building, and that your sessions of to-morrow will be held there, so that it will be made historic from this time by the resolutions which will embody the consensus of your opinion.

We are very glad to be able to tell you that we have shared in the common progress of our country with respect to the care of children,

in that progress in legislation and in good work which has been so marked in the last few years.

In 1903 the commissioners suggested to Congress that they should make a comprehensive report on the care of delinquent and dependent children, and thereafter a resolution was adopted asking for such a report, to which resolution the commissioners, on the 6th of January, 1904, responded with a report covering the whole subject, so far as it concerned the District of Columbia, and recommending that the dependency and delinquency of every child who was sought to be made a public charge should be determined by a juvenile court, which should commit to the Board of Children's Guardians those children not of the reform-school class, and also recommended a probation system for child offenders under probation officers to be appointed by the juvenile court.

This recommendation of legislation, drafted by the commissioners, has been adopted by Congress, and the system, including the juvenile court and its probation work, has been in operation for eighteen months with excellent results. The Board of Children's Guardians, which for over fifteen years has been the public foster father of dependent children, has consistently and successfully followed the policy of placing them in private families, mostly in their own families, without expense to the public.

At the first of this year that board had 1,577 wards, of whom 1,284 were in families, and 293 in institutions, mostly for temporary care or because they were defectives. The governmental record of the District of Columbia with respect to the care of dependent children is therefore, we believe, entirely worthy. The commissioners' bill for the regulation of child labor, which became a law last July, has been effectively enforced, and has met a measure of cooperation from most of the large employers of labor which has made its enforcement very much easier and has produced the most gratifying results.

We have also been able to improve home conditions somewhat in recent years through better laws and appropriations secured since our centennial celebration in 1900, when the new progress of the national capital, physical and moral, began. Therefore our Government is in most hearty sympathy with the great ideals which this conference has before it, and we hope and believe that the results of your labors here will be of the greatest benefit not only to the present but to the future. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The subject of the next address is: The Home versus the Institution, by Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch, president of the National Conference of Jewish Charities.

ADDRESS BY RABBI EMIL G. HIRSCH, D. D., LL. D., PH. D., PRESIDENT NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF JEWISH CHARITIES, OF CHICAGO, ILL., DELIVERED AT THE CONFERENCE HELD IN WASHINGTON, JANUARY 25 AND 26, CALLED ON REQUEST OF THE PRESIDENT.

THE HOME VERSUS THE INSTITUTION.

Mr. HIRSCH. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen: Of different religious beliefs, of various political creeds, and perhaps members of different economic and philosophical schools, yet are we all united by the magic power of certain convictions basic of our meeting here, to the effect that if it is worth while to conserve the natural resources

of our country it is a thousand times more important to conserve the children of our nation. [Applause.]

There is a suggestive significance in the circumstance that this conference is a close second to that convened during the past twelve months in this city, and also at the instigation of the President, for the purpose of considering what measures ought to be devised to put an end to the thoughtless waste of this nation's natural resources. It is not too much to say that our aim is to take counsel together with a view of preserving and augmenting the wealth of the nation. Our solicitude is not for iron and timber and coal and game. The drain which we deplore and which we would end is in human values, infinitely more precious than minerals and food products.

If the study of man by man is the noblest of all intellectual pre-occupations, it is always the last in the hierarchy of the sciences. How to utilize the ores stored in the bowels of the earth arouses the attention of man long before he is stirred to the importance of learning how to save human life and lift it to its highest potency. But true civilization, to quote Emerson, does not rest "on cotton and iron," it is trestled on ideas. It can not be measured, moreover, by the condition of the strongest. The weak are the true barometer indicative of the altitude attained by the race. Not the regard had for and respect paid the strong, but the consideration shown and the anxiety manifested in behalf of the weak, reflect the true glory of a nation's might and reveal the distance that separates it from barbarism. This view is not in accordance with a philosophy, at present much in favor, according to which this world is planned to be the home of the strong alone. The weak—this is the gist of Nietzsche's reasoning—ought to take pride in the thought that they serve for pedestals to the few predestined for strength. They have not been silent who, appealing to the misapplied catchwords of Darwinism, have deplored the sentimentality of these late-born generations evoking to its disadvantage the ruder determination of if more primitive yet also more robust tribes that without false pity exterminated the weak and superfluous. If we draw one lesson from this fanaticism of the prophets of the church of the strong, it is that our efforts must be directed to enlarge the chance of the weak to grow to be strong.

Human weakness is of many degrees and infinite variety. Our concern to-day is for that weakness which is incidental to childhood and results from circumstances in the creation of which the children certainly had no share. It were unjust to say that the appeal of helpless children and orphaned adolescents has not been heard before this hour. The churches of whatever denomination and even society organized as the State have been zealous to a certain extent to give shelter and guidance to homeless and parentless children. Yet the fact stares us in the face that the field has not been covered either sufficiently or efficiently. The State too often has taken cognizance of abandoned children only after dependency has turned into delinquency, and in the more advanced communities modern methods have though been energized in dealing with the young who have come into conflict with society's will embodied in law and statute, the States that have not risen to the understanding of the difference between juvenile delinquency and adult confirmed criminality are still very uncomfortably numerous.

Moreover neither the churches nor the private and public philanthropies that held out the helping hand to the neglected and orphaned children made well devised and concerted efforts to study the problem in all of its complex bearings. That differentiation and elimination are essential to every diagnosis upon which the decision of the needful remedial or auxiliary action pivots. That every case presents an individual aspect, this has been too largely overlooked. The line of least resistance was followed. Institutions were built and equipped more or less wisely to which dependent children were sent, without thought of or inquiry into the possibility of another and better way; or when the effort was made to find homes, supervision often was lax and in the choice of the homes the proper degree of care was not exercised. What of criticism this statement implies is not directed at the intention of the men and women in charge of the institutions or at the head of the home-finding agencies. Nor would I deny that there are bright exceptions to the rule. A more exact survey of the field itself as yet only very imperfectly explored will support my averment.

Institutions represent the line of least resistance. But in morals the line of least resistance is never the first but always the last that ought to be chosen. Childhood is too sacred a possession and too mighty a potentiality to be handled on the ready-made plan. The best of institutions after all must neglect individual differences. They can not take account of personality. They deal with inmates. And inmates necessarily lapse into the nondescript devitalized value of a number. I shall not weigh in this connection the importance attached to institutions to the per capita. They have had dealings with public and for that matter with private charitable institutions, and need not be reminded of the fatal rôle the per capita plays in their administration. Better methods indicated by the progress of medicine and pedagogy are shown no tolerance when their adoption is at all likely to increase the per capita. A low per capita in the fetish and obsession of both superintendents and legislators, and even private institutions suffer from blind worship at the shrine of this idol. To keep the per capita at the lowest figure possible large population is coveted and invited. Whatever the effect of this ambition be on the efficiency of the service in institutions devised for the cure and care of adult dependents, it is clear that it is fraught with grave dangers in those intended for the educating of the young. Discipline of military rigor is absolutely indispensable where hundreds and hundreds of children are herded together in one asylum. No account may be taken of individual needs and no patience can be shown individual idiosyncrasies. The inmates are of necessity trimmed and turned into automatons. The result is the institutional type. They who have had opportunity to observe the mental and perhaps also the moral strabismus, almost invariably characteristic of the young men and women fresh from these institutions, are familiar with the sad and depressing fact that it is symptomatic of the institutional type. They know that the type is marked by repression if not atrophy of the impulse to act independently.

At all events, the institution segregates its inmates. Segregation always results in creating specialized character which sets off the segregated apart from the community, while under normal conditions

they would be, as they should be, part of the community. Class character is not necessarily of weaker moral texture than is the community's. Instances recur to mind where the reverse is true, class outshining the mass in certain regards. But segregation of the young into a class is always beset with peril to their morality.

How easily institutions become foci of moral or rather immoral contamination educators need not be told. Of this I shall not speak at length, as elaboration is superfluous. But attention should be given the injury wrought the soul of a sensitive child by the consciousness, constantly vivified by institutional life and discipline, that he is other than are all the children outside the institution grounds. He is uprooted—"devacine," as the French have it—and placed in surroundings where he is not expected to strike roots anew, though in the better asylums of this land uniforms have been discarded, and thus their wards are spared the humiliation which custom persists in exacting from orphans in Amsterdam, where girls may be seen walking the streets in garments of many colors designating their wearer as one of the beneficiaries of public bounty. Much still remains and always will in institutional life that can not but be torture to children with delicately attuned souls. Spontaneity of the emotional and volitional sides of child nature certainly is dwarfed, if not destroyed, under the rigid discipline which goes with segregation, while the affections—the flower natural to the soul life of the normal child—are apt to starve for lack, as it were, of sunshine and rain. The natural opportunity to give them full play is denied.

Institutional life for the young would be less objectionable if society at large itself were institutionalized. Asylums and orphanages of necessity are organized on a plan which is not that of the world, which sooner or later their protégés have to reenter. Upon their wards thus at the period of their dismissal from the institutions is laid the burden of readjusting themselves to surroundings radically different from those in which they have been raised. And the wrong, the danger, and the strain are all the greater since this period, as a rule, is coincidental with that of puberty, the one period when drain of nerve force should be the least. The plight of those sent out is similar to that of the immigrant from another country. As all asylums must send their wards out into the noninstitutional world, if this word be permissible, institutional preparation is necessarily inadequate, to say the least. As now constituted, the basic rock on which society rests is the home. The family is the structural cell. It seems thus a very queer proceeding first to unhome the young when later they will have to do their part in a society founded on the home and rooted in the family. This expedient may appeal to theorists alone, who have come to regard the family as the Upas tree, abundant in the fruit of selfishness. From the days of Sparta to these, many voices have been heard in laudation of systems fatal to the family spirit and devised to neutralize it. Practically, too, the theory has at present many devotees in our large cities and among certain sets. Modern architecture has lent itself to the conspiracy which aims at terminating the dominancy of the family life and substituting for it again a gregarious mode of living. Cooperative housekeeping and similar devices are some of the euphemistic designations in which the vocabulary of this gospel of defamilized human existence abounds, all of which can not consciously or unconsciously be

reverted to with the objective intention of minimizing family responsibility. The term "flat" in common use for this voluntary institutioning of urban life carries a very significant suggestion. It is indeed a very flat life that thus is abetted, and its outcome in the long run can be none other than race suicide. These theories condemnatory of family life and destructive of family responsibility are condemned by the facts of humanity's evolution. If there is one certainty, it is this, that the family is the direct outcome of nature's own planning to secure the safety and growth of the child. Man stands in need of maternal care much longer than any other animal. This dependency of the child upon the mother forced in course of the ages man to adopt the family and to adapt himself to it. Students of the history of marriage are agreed on this. The helplessness of the child entailing upon the mother for a long-continued period of duties to her offspring, and thus stimulating ever anew the maternal instinct reacted also upon the father. It served to endow with permanency the relations subsisting between him and the mother. In the last analysis monogamy is the outgrowth of this recognition of the claims which the child has on its parents. In thus evolving the monogamic family nature herself has witnessed to the basic importance which attaches to family influence and surroundings in the economy of humanity.

That the home and not the institution is the normal environment for children they have recognized who have made strong efforts to modify the institutional policy, with a view to approximately reproducing the conditions of home surroundings for the dependent children. The cottage plan was devised to meet the shortcomings of the preceding institutional method. That it was a step forward is well assured. But even it is not free from the objections that lie against the institutional device. In the first place, the cottage as a rule is not a reproduction of the home. Families of over 30 children are certainly exceptional. Again, in the cottages as a rule the sexes are segregated, and that for good reasons, and indeed the children are classified according to age, members of this artificial family being selected for living together on account of correspondence of age. The normal family does not segregate the sexes nor does it classify by the age line. In some of the institutions that I have knowledge of this defect has been remedied. In the asylum for soldiers' orphans at Normal, Ill., one of the charities of the State of Illinois, the families are so constituted as to comprise children of all ages. But even then the number constituting the various cottage households is by far in excess of the normal, and dormitories with twenty-five to thirty beds are a poor substitute for the privacy and intimacy of the bedroom in a natural family. If the cottage plan is to be continued, this is clear, the households must be multiplied and the families reduced in number. Otherwise the defects of institutionalism and its artificiality can not be eradicated.

The home plan of course does not work automatically. The placing of the child in the home is only the first step. Supervision through guardians and by agents of the State is the close second. In Illinois the state board of charities is empowered by statute to inspect and visit through agents appointed for this purpose the homes where children have been placed. The legislature, however, has not appropriated sufficient funds to carry on the work on an extended scale.

Furthermore, the state board of charities must pass upon the character of any society organized for home finding before the charter is issued by the secretary of state, and when a certificate is granted it is for one year, renewal depending upon the favorable judgment of the board. In this way exploitation of children and the raids by selfish men and women on the community under pretense of finding homes for dependent children are circumvented. The State, however, in my opinion, should be intrusted only with the general supervision of all the societies engaged in this work and with the duty of visitation of such homes where children have been placed by county authorities. Even in the last-named cases the court should appoint guardians for every child, or when left with the mother or a relative, for the children of that family. Those children that are under the care of philanthropic societies should not be placed under the State, though the State shall always have the right of inspection, and where complaints are brought, if found true, of intervening in behalf of the child.

More difficult are the cases where dependency is the result of abandonment or of parental viciousness and immorality. But again most cases of abandonment are due to wife desertion. Let the mother be aided to keep the family together under the same precautions as to guardians and visitations as have been outlined in the case of dependency due to the death of the parent. Mothers, in fact, should be pensioned when the alternative is placing the child into an institution and the mother going to work or the child's suffering for want of attention. By forcing the mother into the competitive struggle for wage harm is done to her and her child and to many others. The mother that devotes herself to her child and household renders social service of inestimable value. It is her right to expect compensation at the hand of society that ultimately and often immediately is the gainer by her maternal devotion. Let me suggest that the cause of unmarried mothers and illegitimate children is as yet too cruelly ignored. Even these children and mothers are worth saving, and their cause is not in essentials different from that of other helpless mothers and children. In the long run, pensioning mothers is cheaper than building almshouses and jails and reformatories. Keep the mothers at home and a long stride is taken on the road leading away from pauperism and that which causes it—alcoholism and domestic anarchy. I should never separate children from their parents or brothers and sisters from one another wherever it is possible to keep the family intact. In this work "preserve the family" must be our watchword. Where this is not given unto us, find another family that the child may come to its own, a healthy childhood under the inspiration of love and the sunshine of affection, with the freedom to find himself spontaneously both in play and in work.

Out of the mouths of babes, sings the old Hebrew poet, "Thou hast established strength." Yea, the degree of civilization which a nation may boast of is never higher than what is indicated by the strength established out of the mouths of babes. "What ye do to the least of these you have done for me." This is true to-day as it was when it was uttered by the great Jewish lover of children whose love made radiant the hilltops of Palestine in days of yore.

Every consideration, then, points to the desirability of abandoning the institutional plan. Institutions for the care of dependent chil-

dren should hereafter serve but one purpose; that of affording temporary shelter until homes are found for those that need them.

Home finding is not as it is generally assumed to be. Statistics seem to warrant the conclusion that nearly 60 per cent of the cases of child dependency are those of half orphans, and of these more than one-half are fatherless. At least this is the situation in the Jewish orphanages. Had the mother economically been in the situation to provide for her children she would never have consigned them to an institution. In cases of this order then the home is at once ready wherein to rear the child. All that is needed is to help the mother financially. Such financial aid in the guise of a weekly stipend for the maintenance of the child will also keep the mother from sinking into the dependent class. That even where the child is left with the mother guardians shall be appointed who look after the physical, moral, and intellectual welfare of the child goes without saying. These guardians, if conscientious, will become friends of the mother and her advisers, not merely for the child's guidance, but also for her own affairs. This is an undoubted gain for the mother. Her usefulness as a member of society can not be heightened in consequence. But the guardians themselves will also be beneficiaries. Every new duty adds to our moral power. To find well-equipped guardians is by no means a matter of insuperable difficulty. At least I have abundant faith in humanity to believe this proposition to be well within the bounds of accuracy.

What now, when the mother has been taken away? Or when both parents have passed to the beyond? In most of these cases relatives may be found who will gladly take the children into their homes if the additional economic burden is not placed on their shoulders. Only in the rarest of instances resort must be had to homes of non-relatives. But even then, with care and diligence, proper homes will be discoverable.

Objection is often urged that the "homes" whence for the most part the dependent children have come are neither inviting nor, as a rule, so located as to promise well for the moral and physical health of the young. This may be admitted, but far from weakening the efficacy of the plans here proposed, it lends it new emphasis. By extending financial aid to the mother or other foster parent we shall enable her to find for her family shelter in other quarters of the city. The social necessities into which rescue work enters are so interwoven that action at one point can not but affect all others. The problem of how to house the economically less strong at first blush seems to stand in no nexus with the subject under discussion. But it is easy to see that this is not true. By aiding the child to remain with the mother we wield an influence at the same time making for the wiping out of the slums. In rural towns and districts the housing perplexity is absolutely negligible.

We have covered a great distance and are a long way from the low swamp of those days when dependent children were confined to the county almshouse or were left to an even worse fate than that. Great societies have devoted their energy, their wisdom, and their resources to the sacred cause of saving child life; but it seems to some of us that we might, with a little better insight on our part and with a wider wisdom, accomplish still more than has hitherto been wrought in this field.

It is my opinion that the line of least resistance has been too largely followed in this work. Institutions were created and they represent, to my mind, the line of least resistance. But in morality the line of least resistance is the last one to be chosen and not the first to be followed. In economics perhaps, in mechanics perhaps, it is advisable to seek out the line of least resistance; but the normal teacher knows that in moral life the line of the greatest resistance is that which is to be commended, and that the greater the effort the nobler the result and the richer the fruitage.

Institutions offer a ready shelter, education, and what not to all who are put under their protection. Far be it from me to belittle the intention of those who have created institutions, or even the wisdom of those who have administered them; but observation of some extent confirms the impression that institutional life is not the natural life for children to be forced into. Nature herself has taught us that the family is the institution which, in the course of evolution, tends to conserve the things best for human life.

For thousands and thousands of years the institutional life, so to speak, was the form into which life cast itself. The family was evolved in the course of time. Biology teaches us that it is the very dependence of the child which renders the family indispensable, and that in the human species, the child is so long dependent, in its helplessness, upon the mother care that the father was forced to become attached to his offspring. It is the dependency of the child upon the mother love and the establishment of the organic union by which the parents find themselves consecrated to responsibility, through which the child receives its inalienable right to education and protection.

Institutions may be necessary, and when they are necessary they are necessary for the child whose parents are still living as well as for those who are dependent; but the institution should only be invoked for the dependent child in cases where even if nondependent they would be asked to receive them. In all other cases I think the family life is the natural life. It is the life which nature has decreed, through its evolutions; it is that form of life in which the human species can best develop. [Applause.]

Institutions, of necessity, are, to a certain extent, always bound to interfere with individuality of the wards and the larger the institution the greater is the need of discipline. Discipline always makes for the elimination of individuality. When you have a thousand or twelve hundred children under one roof you can not do justice to the idiosyncracies and the needs of the individual child. Everything has to be regularly done on the military or barracks plan. They have to eat together, to hold their spoons sometimes at the same angle, to pray at the same moment, to play at the same time, and to go to bed at the hour indicated. There is no other possibility.

In public institutions, the per capita feature comes into play. Every public institution desires to keep the per capita down to as low a figure as possible. When you go to your legislature and ask for an appropriation, the first question is: What is your per capita? Your per capita is too large. The per capita is reduced if the number of inmates is increased, and so public institutions, at least those that I know, seek to crowd in as many children as possible, in order that the per capita may be reduced to the lowest possible level.

One other thing is generally forgotten. Who can look into the soul of a child? Many children are indifferent to the fact that they are set apart from the others; but there may be children who are touched and tortured to the very quick by the thought that they are different from all other children. I saw in Amsterdam—and many of you may have seen them—children of a public orphanage parading the streets in garments of an historic mold and make, and those children, by their uniforms, were set apart from all other children. While some of the girls seemed to enjoy the distinction, some of the eyes of those that paraded the streets in those uniforms were wet with tears and their cheeks were suffused with blushes. The delicate sentiments of the child were injured by the very fact that he had become an object of exhibition, a sort of public recipient of public benevolence.

Is it possible to give to the dependent child a family life? It is. Fifty per cent of the dependent children are half orphans, where the mother is still spared to the child. No mother will give up her child willingly. Every mother will keep her child—every good mother, and most mothers are good, provided the economic burden is lifted from her shoulders. She has rendered to society a service by becoming a mother, and she continues to render a social service if she devotes herself to her child and brings her child up to good citizenship. Then society is morally bound to help the mother discharge that purpose for which nature has called her, and society, in aiding the mother, keeps the child at home, helps the child, and in many and many a case saves the mother. This is the way to meet the question. The mother being alive, the home is ready without any need to look elsewhere. The home is there. Of course the mother alone may not be efficient. Then appoint for every child a guardian, and not a guardian necessarily appointed by the court or by some institution.

Can those guardians be found? I believe in humanity; I believe that the child's cry will be heard by every true woman in this land, and when she is asked to become a friend of the child, and thereby the friend of the mother, no American mother will refuse to do so. Where the mother is dead you, in many cases, find a relative who will gladly take the child.

Of course there may be conditions under which the child should be placed in an institution. We heard here this afternoon that at a certain time in the life of boys institutional life seems to be somewhat profitable. The English experience has been invoked. A French writer of recent years, in discoursing upon the excellence of the Anglo-Saxon manhood, has compared the Anglo-Saxon civilization with the culture of France and has called attention to the fact that in France they have institutional life throughout, while in England they have it only as a temporary expedient. As a temporary expedient for a brief period in the life of boys and girls institutional discipline may be vindicated. Against this I shall not raise my voice, but as a substitute for the freedom and naturalness of a home life I can not advocate the claim on the part of the institution. We have to preserve the family as the corner stone of society. At two ends family life seems to be in danger—at the top of what is called society, and at the bottom. At the top we have departmental life, or flat life as it is significantly called, and it is flat life—flat life, leading to a shirking of the responsibilities of maternity and paternity.

At the bottom, home life is in danger in the lower strata of society. Let a law be passed making the tenement house impossible. Give to those who have children to rear a real home, and my plan will enable you to do this. Let us give to the dependent children what we gave to our children, in all cases where it is possible—the family life, for the great lover of childhood, whose life made radiant the hilltops of Palestine, has said: "Whatsoever you have done unto one of the least of these, you have done it unto me." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The next address will be on "Family Influence," and the speaker, the Right Rev. D. J. McMahon, supervisor of Catholic charities, archdiocese of New York.

ADDRESS OF RIGHT REV. D. J. McMAHON, SUPERVISOR OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES, ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK.

FAMILY INFLUENCE.

Mr. McMAHON. Under the head of "Family Influence" comes three questions which I will endeavor to answer separately:

First question. Shall relief be given to parents in temporary destitution? To ask the question is to give an affirmative answer. Whence shall this help come? It might well be left to private charity rather than to public charity, for reasons potent to all.

The temporary destitution may come from moral as well as economic reasons, and private charity is better equipped to strengthen the moral tone and it is oft more inclined to help in bringing about an economic adjustment by obtaining work, etc. Being in temporary destitution every chance of hurting self-respect and proper dignity should be avoided, and none will gainsay that regular private charity can do this more effectively than any outdoor relief.

Second. The question of breaking up families, where inefficiency and immorality abide, has also only one answer, for "Example is more potent than word," and the conscience of each true citizen tells him that children must be preserved as far as possible from either of these evils. This can not be done by keeping the child in the danger from the conduct of those whom it is taught to respect.

The family is the unit of the State and upon its safety and perpetuity not only government and order, but the race itself depend. The Creator has implanted in man the desire of perpetuity which is to be carried out not only through his soul in his after life, but by his continuance through his children in this life. This instinct of continuing existence generates in the right-minded parent love for his children. There is no need of command on the Almighty's part to require this love. It is instinctive from nature itself. There is, however, a command for the child so that it may remain united in love and respect with those who have its future to establish. Thus is the family to be united through the decrees of the Author of Nature. We see its unity required in its formation. From the first man, according to the Bible, came the wife—not from his head that she might command; not from his foot that he might crush her, but from his side, nigh to his heart, that she may be ever at his side, his companion, and the child is the fullness of the love that binds them—"A triple cord, who can break?"

The doctrine of ancestral worship in its many historical forms has been beneficial by teaching family reverence and though false is nearer truth than its opposite, of disregard for parents, as among some tribes. See its advantages, though overdrawn, among the Romans of the regal times and the Greeks of the Homeric age, who venerated their ancestors and the private Gods of the house. So also the ancient Egyptians; so again in this day in its elaboration among millions of Hindus; as a powerful force among the Japanese, and all-pervading among the Chinese. The family then should be kept intact.

Ten years ago a committee of the National Conference of Charities and Correction used these words "All workers agree that the home is the natural place to properly develop a child." The emphasis is rightly put on the home and not on the family. The home means the verile and chastening virtues of the parents engrafting themselves into the characters of the progeny. It is yet to be found in numbers but can we not put too much stress upon its influence in our day? If it be truly a home there need never be fear of overdrawn sentiment. On the other hand do we not recognize with Doctor Rauschenbush in his "Christianity and the Social Crisis" "that the old time family influence has been weakened by modern democracy which was quickened into new life by the American and French Revolution and particularly, by the industrial and economic revolutions of the past century." When families were pioneers and had struggles in their surroundings the children were moulded better because of the needed mastery of the parents. Parents must now, however, recognize that the old time reverence and influence is much diminished and that the school, companions, the social set, have taken the greater part of the molding which belonged to the home circle of the past.

In a recent play this thought can be seen in the expression, "Three brothers in a family good in these times! Nonsense!" The sociologists who met a month ago in Atlantic City spoke most clearly in this same strain.

The consequence of this would be that too much weight may be given to the idea of keeping up family ties. Do not many parents of their own volition send their children to boarding schools and thus remove them from the immediate contact with the family? This they do because they feel that the influence of companions, social class, and good teachers will be more beneficial for the child than even their own family circle. In the homes of such children, who are perhaps as numerous as are the children dependent upon charity homes, there is not the struggle for existence which calls out the frequent application among the poor of the first law of nature—self-preservation—and begets oftentimes some antagonism between parent and child. When there is frequent thought for subsistence, when the lines of life run in the channels of misery, as must be the case where a family is dependent on charity, the beneficial influence of family life is surely stunted. The constant idea is for the necessities of the body and the "bread line" does not lead to ennobling life. Do not, then, let us make a fetish of the family life or conceive it as so sacro sanct that all must fall before its juggernaut wheels to be crushed out of existence.

The family influence has been weakened by the advances of the day, and consequently, whilst the family home connected and united

with all other proper developing influences is the best, yet since these outside molding powers can be otherwise obtained, independent of family life, we need not fear its breaking up, when circumstances would seem to require it. This surely would be the case when immorality or inefficiency dwells in the home.

Third question: Is poverty alone, as in the case of worthy widows, sufficient cause for the disruption of families? Four answers are given, and each has its strong upholders and its no less valiant opponents.

1. That the family should be supported from public funds.
2. That the family should be supported from private charity.
3. The children should be placed in family homes.
4. The children should be placed in institutions.

Everywhere in looking into child-saving work, we find it only in an experimental state. For over thirty years in national conferences has this subject been discussed, and we are no nearer a settled basis of unity in thought. We have cleared the atmosphere from many fogs of misconception, and we recognize that each is sincere in his adopted scheme. We may ask ourselves, Is there a possibility of reaching a definite single conclusion that will apply alike to all localities? The question of child saving is a principle of humanity to which we all give full accord. There may be some difference among men as to the meaning of child saving, for the religious man of any creed does not conceive the thought in the same terms as does the purely nonsectarian, and here is often the cause of trouble among us charity workers, and let us get to some clear understanding, so that each will recognize the justice of the other's contention. Child saving means not only the caring for the physical, mental, and ethical life of the child, but it broadens out in the concept of thousands of workers to the religious and moral training. It is to be hoped that as days pass much of the bitterness caused on this score between workers will also pass.

We must, aye, we must recognize in each field faithful friends of poor children according to our knowledge. St. Beuve divided authors into two classes—"Those who agitate and those who make progress for the world." So, in the present question, some are forever finding cause for agitating it, but as yet they have not molded all answers into one. We do not think that one sole answer which would be progress can be given to the question. We must disagree, according to the traditions of locality, and make progress in the natural lines of least resistance. Methods of child saving in this country must be employed according to the peculiar conditions of the state or traditions. Surely, a metropolis must be different in its treatment from that of an obscure village.

There is beauty in variety both of scene and of activity. Doctor Butler says, in "True and false Democracy:" "It is said that if all the mountains of Europe were leveled off it would result in producing a barren, dismal plain some 900 feet higher than the present shore line. The beauty and productiveness of a continent would be gone. If all the wealth of the United States were divided equally among the population it is estimated that we should each possess a capital of about \$1,100. Industry would be reduced to the lowest level ever known in modern times, everything which makes life agreeable would go out of it, and we should all be driven to a conflict and strug-

gle for a bare existence, to which the state of primitive war described by Hobbes would be as nothing."

So, the diversity of convictions that have founded the various methods of child saving makes for beauty. Let the valley then remain between the hills and the stream flow between its banks gracefully, adorning them with the flowered seeds it has brought in its course.

We must have play by different methods for what Kipling has called the "Hideous versatility of Americans." Methods are only policies, and these according to circumstances can be changed. Let there then be liberty to each according to the just need, and to all according to truth.

On the programme of speakers to-night, being the only one from New York, I must naturally uphold its policy, now in vogue for over a century. I doubt that any State can look so far back in child saving, and we all must agree that no State can ever have the same measure of such work as ours. For New York is the reception place for most all immigrants, of whom nearly one-third and the poorest remain with us, and at the same time it is the great receiving depot for the impoverished and shiftless of our own country.

Policies that might suit elsewhere will not fit here. Nor can changes be easily made in methods, for there is an army of dependents, and always will be, that would be affected by any changes. We have our system of institutional care of dependent children, and those close in touch with the work can see no other easy solution.

We can not look favorably upon the first answer of giving public aid to widows so that they may receive what is already given to institutions for care of children. Those who have had experience of the great abuses that arose in the public giving of coal some years ago can not be convinced that any supervision will free this solution from constant abuse.

Cupidity will devise schemes of every kind in the minds of that very large number who come to our shores on one purpose bent—to make money. Outdoor relief may work good results in some places, but the portentous fact of its past history stands out fully illumined. When England increased 70 per cent in population her expenses for charity during the régime of the outdoor poor law, from 1770 to 1834, increased 530 per cent. There can be no doubt that thousands would make every possible plea for such help, where now only hundreds seek relief through institutions, for few wish to part with their children. Put aside the money consideration, and would the self-respect, the dignity of the family, be promoted by the public reception of the weekly dole as a constant reminder of their dependency?

To keep the children in the family by aid from private charitable agencies is out of the question according to our present methods. About \$1,000,000 were spent last year in the homes of the poor of New York City (\$600,000 given by the four large societies), and that did no more than keep them simply from starvation. If the care of families with their 20,000 children in our institutions were placed upon private charity, meaning an expense of nearly \$3,000,000 more, we would be obliged to go into bankruptcy. It would simply be impossible. Every proper device is used to get the money now being spent, and there is no chance whatever of reaching out beyond to carry this enormous burden.

The third answer of family homes where these children may be placed as free or on board is not practicable in our city. Every placing-out agency in New York finds it extremely difficult to find free homes in that State and are, consequently, operating in other quarters. It would be no less arduous to find boarding homes for the large number of dependent children that must naturally fall to our great city.

It is true that New York has not tried any of these three methods except, perhaps, in rural districts. Institutions have been its solution for the care and custody of its dependents, for they have grown up with it and have become fastened into its very substance by reason of the different interests involved. Private institutions are the caretakers of all our dependent children. In the administration of these are to be found devoted men and women whose lives and souls are in the children.

The influence of the superintendent makes itself felt throughout, and those in direct charge of the fledglings endeavor to make up for the loss of the home by a system of "mothers" in charge of small bands of children who come to them with their tales of joy and woe. The school life is as well conducted as in the schools without. Companionship is also under vigilance, that all those parts that go to mold the character are welded together as well as in the family.

We hear much about the mechanical drill to meals, the unnatural silence, the absence of expressive faculties, and so forth, ad nauseam. What are these but manners, even be they as dreadful as they are frightfully pictured by antagonists for a purpose? Their influence on character and development is of meager weight.

There has been a decided and long-stepped progress in our Catholic institutions in the past ten years, and I feel certain that the same can be said of all others. One would think from the examinations of the state board of charities that they would want our institutions to be equal to the best academies of the State. The average length of time which a child spends in an institution is less than eighteen months, and fully 75 per cent are returned to their parents or near relatives. Only about one-third of the applications for the commitment of children are accepted, and during the past seven years or more there has been no increase in the number of children committed to the institutions of New York City, despite the great increase in population. Last year, however, owing to the hard times there was a little addition.

I have no hesitation in saying in conclusion that the health of the children is far better than it would be in a family home; that their education is cared for; that their play, their conduct is suited to their years, and that for devotion and self-sacrifice to their interests none can compare with the sisters and brothers who watch over these wards of the State. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The next address of the evening will be on "Modern Devices for Minimizing Dependency," by Miss Jane Addams, President Hull House, Chicago.

ADDRESS OF MISS JANE ADDAMS, PRESIDENT HULL HOUSE,
CHICAGO.

MODERN DEVICES FOR MINIMIZING DEPENDENCIES.

Miss ADDAMS. If my topic contemplated the devices for minimizing the labor in harvesting a field of wheat, or producing a gross of buttons, if I were asked to name the world's famous inventions for minimizing mechanical friction or for saving human labor, there is no doubt that the inventions would all be American, and that if I were challenged I could quite simply invite you to take a walk through the neighboring patent building. But when we are asked to consider together the newest devices for minimizing dependency, those inventions which keep the wage-earning parents alive and able to care for their own children in an average workingman's home, unfortunately for our pride, we who are assembled in our nation's capitol, called together by the Chief Executive, are obliged to enumerate the devices found in almost every other modern nation in greater abundance than they are found in America.

For those devices which would minimize the dependency resulting from the premature death of the mother we may go to any seven of the greater European nations, which prohibit all-night work for women, because it is found to be an extravagant waste of that tender strength which should be preserved for the bearing and rearing of children. Five European States have carefully limited the number of hours in which a woman may work by day, grading those hours according to the various industries in which it was found that the labor was so exhausting that the women who engage in it die prematurely, leaving their little children dependent upon the State, a matter to be regretted even if they are placed in those ideal foster homes of which we have heard to-night.

If we go further, and ask what Switzerland does, taking our exhibit, if you please, from that small Republic which in so many ways is analogous to our own, we will find that every child of a widow, who is of school age, receives at the end of a successful week in school a scholarship from his canton. He receives the money strictly as a scholarship and takes it home to his mother, not because he is the recipient of charity, and certainly she does not feel that she is thereby an object of charity at the hands of her fellow-citizens, but because the lawgivers of Switzerland have found out that it is to the advantage of the State that a child should go to school when he is under fourteen years of age quite as much as it is to the advantage of the State that an older child should be at work. And the boy, in doing this, is preparing himself to give later adequate care to his widowed mother and to his younger brothers and sisters—not the insufficient care that can be given by an ignorant untrained man. It often happens in America that the eldest child in the family of a widow goes to work prematurely, before he has had an opportunity to learn a trade, and in the end his mother comes back on the community for support and all the younger members of the family are objects of charity because his childish strength is quickly exhausted. In addition to her other burdens the mother has an invalid to care for. [Applause.]

If we go to Germany we will have to mark her "Exhibit A" in the matter of devices for minimizing dependency. In the year 1904, 100,000 children in the Empire of Germany received benefits from industrial accident insurance which is carried on, as you know, in Germany mutually by the employers, by the workman, and by the funds of the Empire itself.

What children's society in this land of ours can show a record of 100,000 children cared for in their homes, and cared for without any taint of charity? The German Empire has decided that it is good economy that these children should be thus preserved, first, by insuring their parents against accident, and, secondly, by paying the wife and children when the wage-earner is invalidated.

One can find in Germany wonderful provisions for the care of the family in which the wage-earner has contracted tuberculosis. What suffering does the man undergo who sees before him three years of tedious illness, knowing that long before the end of it his children may begin for the first time to be the recipients of charitable aid. In Germany such a man is taken to a sanitarium, not only for his care, but that he may there learn some outdoor occupation. His wages, although they be but small, are given to his family, and they may be supplemented in various ways. The family does not feel that it is receiving charity, but realizes that the community and every one concerned is guarding against a dire disaster which might permanently throw them on the community as orphans. Such a family is being protected not only from charitable aid, but from a great sorrow and irreparable loss.

If one goes into England one finds there the employers' liability act, a device against dependency which we are slowly contemplating in America—I am happy to say that at this session of the legislature in Wisconsin, and I believe also in Massachusetts, it is being considered. That act requires that the employer bears his share in the loss of life and limb which comes to his workmen. In this way, at least, England preserves her own workingmen, so that they may provide for their own children and may add to the strength and prosperity of the nation.

Why is it that we have been so slow in America to follow these modern devices for minimizing dependency? Why is it that we, at best, are suggesting foster families rather than schemes for preserving the natural family of the father, the mother, and the little children living together as they were meant to live? It is, perhaps, against our Anglo-Saxon traditions that the State should come in and render this aid. Are we afraid of "paternalism" or of some of the other hard words which we so readily apply to such undertakings in America? If we insist upon being so much more Anglo-Saxon than England itself, if we contend each man must take his own risk of life and limb and must care for his own family, possibly a remedy could be found if we approached the whole situation from the point of view of the little child. The child has always appealed to America. We have been reckless and extravagant for him, as is evidenced by the immense expenditure for our splendid public education, surpassing that of any country in the world. [Applause.]

It may be that if we approach these great governmental measures of mitigating and ameliorating the harshness of modern industry from the desire to protect the child and to preserve him from depend-

ency, that we will be able to stand with other nations in the variety and efficiency of our devices.

If this conference results in some such thing as that we may be able to look at each little child with a sense of security and see in his eyes a mirror of a future which will be happier, brighter, healthier, and saner than the life which any of his predecessors were able to live. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The subject of the next address will be "Preservation of the Family Home," and the speaker, Mr. David F. Tilley, member state board of charities of Massachusetts.

ADDRESS OF MR. DAVID F. TILLEY, MEMBER STATE BOARD OF CHARITIES OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. TILLEY. I desire that my presentation of the proposition suggested for consideration at this meeting shall be regarded from the standpoint of what our experience in Massachusetts has been, and while my expressions are entirely personal, I am confident that they are shared by the great majority of those engaged in both public and private relief work in our State.

One of the questions for consideration is the keeping together of worthy families where, by reason of death, accident, or temporary lack of employment the family is unable to provide the means necessary for their maintenance. To me it is quite impossible to conceive that anyone would be willing to break up a family because of their dependence alone. It is, of course, impossible to lay down rules that will apply to all sections of this great country of ours, and, as stated before, my conclusions are reached from the experience in my own State of Massachusetts, where the charity workers have given some—indeed, I may say much—thought to the problem.

We will probably all agree that the home is the natural place for the child. It is only when the home ceases to be such, when parents through extreme sickness, dissipation, or abandonment, make the preservation of the home impossible, that it should be broken up. We should never encourage the separation of children from worthy parents if it can possibly be avoided. At times families becoming destitute and dependent upon charity seem to lose courage and resign all hope at the prospect of what they consider insurmountable difficulties and immediately seek to have their children placed, temporarily at least. To this we should ever be opposed, and consider it our duty to keep the family together. In my opinion money expended for rent and buying of food, fuel, and clothing is the very best investment which can be made if it results in saving the home. There can be no stronger incentive, it seems to me, for men and women to lead good lives and exert themselves to be useful citizens than the possession of children, and only the most urgent reasons should lead us to break up families.

It should always be our aim to make families self-supporting, supplying temporary assistance only; still, occasions arise when it is necessary to carry cases along for a term of years, as for example, where the father of a large family is removed by death and the mother is unable to provide entirely for the needs of herself and children. But who shall say that money thus invested does not yield a good return to the community? I believe that outdoor relief given in a wise and discriminating manner will tend to lessen the

number of dependents, as it helps to keep the family intact, and generally, if the home is a good one, the child will grow up a self-respecting citizen and be able to contribute something toward the support of the parent or parents.

It may be a much easier problem to remove the children from the home where want exists and allow the parent to shift for himself or herself—but who will contend that this is doing our full duty? Then, too, we must remember that accidents and disease come to the industrious as well as to the thriftless. It is not sufficient that financial aid alone be given, but also the services of a friendly visitor should be employed. Good as his intentions may be, it is not always possible for the paid public official to devote much time to any individual case, hence the necessity of securing some one to supplement his efforts.

In the great majority of cases we will find that causes exist which, when corrected, make the family at once self-supporting. The aid of the church to which the applicant is attached should always be invoked to help in the upbuilding of the home and everything possible done to stimulate in the family the obligation of self-support.

Massachusetts, with a population of something over 3,000,000, for the year ended November 30, 1908, expended in outdoor relief (by outdoor relief we mean aid given in the homes of the poor) \$1,201,727.85. This, of course, does not include relief given by private charitable organizations and individuals, which is very considerable, but that alone given by the State, cities, and towns from public funds. The question has been asked, Does outdoor public relief tend to increase pauperism? The answer, from our experience in Massachusetts, is that it does not. For a period of twenty years we find that the state board of charity of Massachusetts has had applications as follows: In 1888 we had requests from 2,025 families for aid; in 1907, only 2,034, notwithstanding the population of the State had increased in the meantime over 30 per cent. In 1893-94 and 1898-99, periods of depression in business, the numbers increased very materially, but this should not be considered as having much bearing on the problem, as conditions were far from normal.

The visitors in the adult poor department of the Massachusetts state board of charity were recently asked this question, Does outdoor public relief tend to diminish pauperism?

I desire to read to you the following answer from one of the visitors, same being typical of all those received:

I am of the opinion that relief in the home does tend to lessen pauperism, for the reason that in most cases it is temporary and brings with it advice and assistance which helps the applicant to become self-supporting. It prevents the permanent support of many, and keeps the burden of support of family in the home, where it belongs. The work contingent upon giving outdoor relief should lessen the need of material charity and thus decrease pauperism.

The figures furnished by the overseers of the poor of the city of Boston also show striking results. For the year 1888 they report 2,978 families aided; in 1907, only 2,060, a large decrease in the number aided, notwithstanding the growth of the community.

I am not, however, unmindful of the dangers to the community, as well as too often the injury to individuals, from indiscriminate almsgiving, and contend that outdoor relief to be successful must be administered in a wise and discriminate manner and by officials who

in addition to having big souls and plenty of good common sense, are not governed and controlled by political influence. We have not yet reached this ideal condition in all the cities and towns of Massachusetts, but are striving for it.

I shall also answer in the affirmative the second query, "Should children normal in mind and body, and not requiring special training, who must be removed from their homes, be cared for in families, wherever practicable."

I have already expressed my opinion as to the necessity of keeping children with their parents, but this question concerns children who must be removed from their own homes. We should differentiate between children who are to be removed from their own homes for a very limited time and those who are to be permanently cared for outside of their own family circle.

The first class—those to be cared for only for a limited time—may well be kept in a temporary home or institution where they will be inculcated with habits of cleanliness and regularity which may be of benefit to them upon returning to their own homes.

Children normal in mind and body, who are to be forever separated from their own homes, should be placed in another family home as soon as possible. Children boarded in families are usually placed in small numbers, so that the family idea always predominates. They have their education and their play in common with the children of the neighborhood, and grow up like them. The power of initiation and of aggressiveness grows through their competition in games and sports with those of their kind. They are good, bad, or indifferent, like the average child, and receive their reward or punishment, or are ignored, like the rest of us. They grow up and furnish the average percentage of useful citizens. This, at least, has been our experience in Massachusetts, and while the conditions which prevail with us are not similar to those of New York, I believe they are what may be expected in the average community.

To those who say that this plan is ideal and impossible to practice, it may be answered that in Massachusetts at this moment there are 4,343 boys and girls placed in private families, growing up normally and naturally, who are under the constant care and supervision of the state board of charity. Of course we would have many times this number if we were to take away children from families temporarily incapable of self-support, but I have previously explained that it is not our policy to do this.

That placing children in families is difficult and a problem that requires much patience and constant oversight is true, but if the end sought is to rear boys and girls who are to be good citizens, able to perform their duties independent of constant guidance and direction, there can be no question that the time, patience, and money expended are well worth while.

The CHAIRMAN. The next address will be "The Evolution of Child-placing," by Dr. Hastings H. Hart, chairman Study of Child-Placing, Russell Sage Foundation.

ADDRESS BY HASTINGS H. HART, LL. D., SUPERINTENDENT OF
THE ILLINOIS CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE CHILD-PLACING MOVEMENT.

Virginia, 1619—Child immigrants apprenticed.

The child-placing movement dates back at least to the day when his sister Miriam placed the infant Moses in the home of Pharaoh's daughter. She was very fortunate in her selection, and he turned out very well. In this country it began, probably, in 1619, when the mayor of London sent out to the Virginia Company 100 children, "to be placed with honest and good masters." The Virginia Company decreed that they "be educated and brought up in some good trade and profession, whereby they may be able to get their living and maintain themselves when they shall attain their several ages of "ffouer and twenty years or be out of their apprenticeships, which shall endure at the least seaven years if they so long live."

This law and similar laws enacted in other colonies contemplated the relation of the master and servant, and in many cases the bound boy and the bound girl were in a condition not very different from slavery. But there is a better way, namely, to place children where they will become members of the family and be treated as sons and daughters. Many children were so placed in families by benevolent individuals and by managers of orphan asylums in the early years of this country; but many others were placed in orphan asylums and kept there until young manhood and womanhood. There was no organized plan of placing children in family homes and there were no societies devoted to that specified work.

New York, 1853—The New York system.

The pioneer of the organized child-placing movement was Charles Loring Brace who, in 1853, organized the New York Children's Aid Society and began sending children to western homes. Mr. Brace took issue with those who advocated a long course of training for children in institutions. He maintained that institutional care was unnecessary for healthy, normal children, except for very brief periods. He took children from the streets of New York and sent thousands of them to farm and village homes. At first the children were distributed without much formality and with imperfect supervision; but for many years the work has been thoroughly organized. Homes are carefully selected and trained workers are employed to visit and befriend the children. The society is still placing out children at the rate of 600 to 700 yearly, and its records show that the great body of these children have done well and have made good citizens.

Great numbers of children have been placed in family homes by individual institutions of New York like the Brooklyn Children's Aid Society, the New York Juvenile Asylum, the Catholic Protector, the New York Infant Asylum, and the New York Foundling Asylum; but notwithstanding these efforts, the number of dependent children in institutions in New York has multiplied. The reports of the State Board of Charities September 30, 1907, showed 29,820

dependent children in institutions. The special report of the United States Census Bureau showed that New York had in institutions, out of every 100,000 inhabitants, December 31, 1904, 317 dependent children; Massachusetts, 129; Illinois, 99.

A great step forward was taken when the Catholic Home Bureau for dependent children was organized in 1898. The bureau acts as the placing agent for Catholic children for the department of public charities of the city of New York and also for more than 20 Catholic institutions. In the ten years of its existence it has placed out 2,035 children; in the past year, 282.

Most of the placing-out agencies in New York act as agents of the public authorities and are reimbursed in part for the expense of placing out from the public treasury.

The New York Children's Aid Society was followed by the organization of the Pennsylvania Children's Aid Society, the Boston Children's Aid Society, and the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society of Baltimore; auxiliary societies or other similar societies were organized in New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, all of which adopted the plan of placing out children in family homes.

Massachusetts, 1867—The Massachusetts system.

In 1660 the Massachusetts colony passed an act authorizing selectmen who "shall find masters of families negligent of their duty, whereby children and servants become rude, stubborn, and unruly * * * take such children or apprentices from them and place them with some master who will more strictly look into and force them to submit unto government." The idea of master and servant was prominent for many years.

In 1866 the Massachusetts state reform schools had a population of 625 children and the state almshouse had a population of 600 children. There were about 1,000 indentured children who were wards of the State, but without adequate supervision. On the initiative of Dr. S. G. Howe, chairman, and Prof. Frank B. Sanborn, secretary of the State Board of Charity, a visiting agent was appointed for the oversight of these indentured children. In 1867, the State Board of Charity suggested that the board should be paid for some of the troublesome children, including infants, "in order to make it worth the while of better families to receive the children."

The Massachusetts system differed from the New York system in that there was no partnership between the private institution and the public treasury. State funds were expended by agents of the State and private societies were sustained by private donations and endowments.

The Massachusetts plan of state care for children grew rapidly until there are now in private families on board 2,600; in private families free, 1,200; total, 3,800.

There is appropriated from the state treasury for the current year for the expense of receiving, placing, boarding, visiting, and supervising children \$452,000.

The State maintains a large corps of agents and visitors to care for this great family.

The city of Boston also maintains an agency to care for children who are, under the settlement laws of Massachusetts, wards of the

city. The city has about 1,000 children under its care in family homes, for whom it expended last year over \$90,000.

The private children's societies of Massachusetts receive no public aid, but are very efficient. In 1884 Mr. Chas. W. Birtwell became the secretary of the Boston Children's Aid Society, and under his leadership that society speedily became an active force. It has exercised a powerful influence to elevate the standard of the public and private child-caring agencies of Massachusetts. Three societies, the Boston Children's Aid Society, the Boston Children's Friend Society, and the Boston Children's Mission work in complete harmony like a single organization. These societies have closed up the receiving homes which they formerly maintained, and furnish both temporary and permanent care for children in family homes, partly with and partly without, payment of board. These three societies expended last year over \$100,000, making a total of about \$650,000 expended in Massachusetts for the care and oversight of children in family homes.

This large expense is caused by two features of the Massachusetts plan: First, the payment of board in family homes, and, second, the thoroughness of the supervision, which exceeds that of any other agencies with which I am acquainted, with a very few exceptions.

Massachusetts has gone farther than any other State in substituting the family home for the institution. The State abolished its Monson School for Dependent Children and diminished the size of the boys' reformatory by one-half twenty-five years ago. The city of Boston closed its home for dependent children; ten or twelve private homes and asylums have been closed, and have not been replaced. Family care has taken the place of these institutions.

Ohio, 1863—The Cincinnati Children's Home.

In the winter of 1863, Mr. Murray Shipley, a Quaker minister and merchant, devised and founded the Cincinnati Children's Home. It is stated by Supt. M. V. Crouse that this was the first institution in the world to be called a "children's home." The children's home adopted from the outset the plan of placing homeless children in family homes and has followed it ever since. It also gives temporary care to needy children who are not eligible for placement.

Later the Cleveland Protestant Orphan Asylum abandoned the policy of bringing up children and began placing out children systematically. It has placed approximately 100 children each year ever since.

These two institutions were the pioneers of a movement in the central States whereby most of the orphan asylums ceased to bring up children to young manhood and womanhood. They became largely places of temporary care where children were either returned to their parents or were early placed in family homes.

Ohio, 1866—County Children's Homes.

In 1866 the Ohio general assembly authorized counties to establish county children's homes in order to remove them from the bad environment of the almshouses. The system grew rapidly until, in 1901, there were 51 county homes, containing 2,250 children. The law contemplated the use of the placing-out system in connection with these

homes, but that branch of activity has never become very efficient. In 1889 a law was passed authorizing each county home to employ a placing-out agent, but very few such agents were appointed. In 1907 a law was passed requiring the children in county homes to be placed out, with the result that many children were removed from county homes by relatives who found means to provide for them when they learned that they were to be placed in families.

The Ohio children's home law requires that children be discharged at the age of 16, and the home authorities then lose guardianship, unless the child has previously been indentured or adopted. That means that the backward, wayward, or defective child, who most needs friendly watch care, loses it at a critical age.

Indiana followed Ohio in adopting the county children's home system. That State established 47 county children's homes, which had, in 1901, 1,633 children. Indiana experienced difficulties similar to those of Ohio. These difficulties were partly met, first, by the establishment of county boards of guardians to be responsible for county wards, and, second, by the establishment of a state agency, as a department of the state board of charities, with authority to place in family homes inmates of county children's homes at their discretion. The result of this law has been a diminished number of children in county homes, partly by placing out and partly through removal by friends. As a result, 8 or 10 county homes have already been closed and the closing of others is impending.

The Indiana State agency has not only the supervision of children placed by it and by county boards of guardians, but has also supervision of children placed in family homes by private agencies. Similar supervision is exercised by state boards of charities or state boards of control in New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and perhaps some other States.

The State of Connecticut adopted the county-home system in 1882, and has experienced difficulties similar to those experienced in Ohio and Indiana. Mr. Homer Folks says, in his book on the care of destitute, neglected, and delinquent children: "The county-home system has been fairly and fully tried and has been found wanting."

Michigan, 1873—State Public School.

In 1873 the State of Michigan opened a state school for dependent children at Coldwater, built on the cottage plan. The law creating this school provided that it should be "only a temporary home, while the child is on its way to its own place in the family." This law was drawn by the late State Senator C. D. Randall. It was required that family homes should be found for the children as early as possible. A state agent was appointed to take general charge of finding homes and of the subsequent visitation and supervision of the children. County agents were also appointed by the governor, on recommendation of the state board of charities and corrections, to cooperate with the state agent.

The state public school has a capacity of 300 children. Within two years it was filled and several hundred children still remained in county almshouses. Zealous legislators said, "The state public school is a grand thing; let us build another." But wiser counsel prevailed. At the end of another two years all children of sound

mind and body had been removed from almshouses, and in a few years the number of children was reduced to about 300, where it has since remained.

The Michigan state public school was kept free from the influence of partisan politics; homes were selected with great care, and children were faithfully supervised. Private societies and orphan asylums were not superseded; there is legitimate work for them to do, but it has been unnecessary for it to assume large proportions.

The Michigan system attracted wide attention at home and abroad. It was adopted by the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Colorado. It stands in high favor in all of those States. It has been especially successful and efficient in Minnesota, under the superintendency of Mr. Galen A. Merrill, formerly agent of the Michigan school.

There is one unique class of state institutions for dependent children. It is a remarkable fact that although the civil war closed forty-four years ago soldiers' orphan homes for the children of soldiers of the civil war are still maintained by the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Kansas.

In Kansas, Iowa, and Illinois laws have been passed authorizing the soldiers' orphans' homes to receive other dependent children and to place them in family homes on plans similar to those of the state public schools, already mentioned. But thus far very little placing-out work has been done by these homes, because their traditions do not run in that direction.

Illinois, 1883—Children's Home Society.

In 1883 a society called the "American Educational Aid Association," which subsequently became known as the "Children's Home Society," was organized in Illinois by Rev. M. V. B. Van Arsdale. This society adopted the general principles followed by the children's aid societies of the East, but it differed from most of them in being a state organization instead of a local one. It was for many years almost exclusively a placing-out society.

Mr. Van Arsdale adopted a simple plan of organization: A central office at Chicago, with a state superintendent; districts including 6 to 25 counties, with district superintendents; local advisory boards in important towns throughout the State to report needy children and to assist in finding homes and supervising children; a small receiving home for the brief temporary care of children awaiting placement.

This plan of organization proved very adaptable. Within twenty-five years there have grown up 29 children's home societies, covering all of the Central States, all of the Pacific States, and a number of the Atlantic and Southern States.

A "National Children's Home Society" was organized and it was at first intended that the national society should exercise administrative control over the state societies, but one by one the state societies declared their independence and took out state charters. The national society ceased to have any administrative control, and its relations to the state societies became advisory. It holds an annual convention and also a midwinter conference of state superintendents. The national society is now a federation of 29 societies, of which the New York Children's Aid Society and the Oregon Boys' and Girls' Aid Society have also become members.

The work of the children's home societies has assumed large proportions. The combined statistics of the 29 societies for the past year show:

Children received for the first time, 3,454; returned for replacement, 1,602; children placed first time, 2,842; replacements, 1,425; total placements and replacements, 4,267; children awaiting placement at close of the year, 800; children under guardianship in family homes, about 16,000. Current expenses, last year, about \$400,000 property accumulated (lands, buildings, furniture, and endowments), about \$750,000.

The early work of the children's home societies was crude and imperfect. They started out without experience, income, or constituency. Poverty prevented adequate supervision. Some of the societies have developed a high degree of efficiency; others are still in the earlier stages of evolution. In most of them there is steady progress in the elevation of standards and the improvement of methods.

Many of the children's home societies are enlarging the scope of their work beyond the simple placing out of children so as to meet as far as practicable all of the needs of dependent and neglected childhood.

In a number of States, like Kentucky, Iowa, South Dakota, etc., the Children's Home Society is recognized as the leading child-helping agency and is influential in every public movement in behalf of children.

New Jersey, 1897—State Board of Guardians.

The New Jersey legislature in 1897 created a "State Board of Children's Guardians." Under this act the governor appoints a board of seven persons to whose custody all children becoming public charges are committed. No state home is maintained, but children are kept at board in families until a "free home" can be found. The board is paid by the county from which they come. The state appropriation is about \$7,000 per year for the maintenance of the board. The payment of counties for board of children amounts to about \$30,000 per year. Board is paid at the rate of \$1.50 per week, with an allowance for clothing and medicines averaging \$16 yearly.

The New Jersey law differs from the laws of Indiana and Massachusetts because the state board of guardians is an independent agency, not attached to a state board of charities (a similar separation has been proposed in Massachusetts).

The New Jersey law differs from the state public school laws of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Colorado, because it provides for no institutional care.

The District of Columbia has a District board of guardians, organized in 1893, with powers similar to those of the New Jersey board, but the District board uses private institutions for temporary care and to some degree for permanent care.

The New Jersey plan of an exclusive board to deal with children who are public wards is being watched with much interest and is likely to find favor in other States.

The state unit is greatly preferable to the county or municipal unit in administering placing-out work, because most of the city children must go to the country, and many of them ought to go to a distance from their original environment in order to escape injury from vicious

parents or any unsavory family history. The state agency covers both the urban and the rural districts, and thus avoids complications and minimizes expense.

New York, 1898.—The Roman Catholic Movement.

The placing-out method is not a new one in the work of the institutions of the Roman Catholic Church. Individual orphan asylums, foundling asylums, etc., have been sending children out into family homes for generations. The New York Foundling Asylum is one of the largest placing-out agencies in the world. It places about 500 yearly, the Catholic protectory of New York about 200, other New York agencies about 400, making a total of about 1,400 children placed out yearly by the Roman Catholic agencies of New York alone.

In Minnesota Archbishop Ireland began boarding infants in family homes about twenty-five years ago. From this beginning, placing-out work was gradually enlarged, so that, notwithstanding the rapid increase of the population, only two new Catholic orphan asylums have been established in Minnesota in the last fourteen years, one with a capacity of 70 children and the other with a capacity of 50. The total capacity of all of the Catholic orphan asylums in Minnesota put together is only 550.

While individual Catholic institutions have done a large placing-out work, the organized effort among the church institutions is very recent. The establishment of the Catholic home bureau in New York in 1898 marked an epoch in the splendid work of the Roman Catholic Church for dependent children. This society enables small asylums, which could not afford to maintain separate agencies, to avail themselves of its trained workers and its thorough and well-considered methods. The bureau is already placing out children at the rate of 300 per year, and has instituted most careful and painstaking methods.

In the report of the Catholic home bureau for 1898, the late Archbishop Corrigan is quoted as follows:

The founders of the bureau realized that our Catholic institutions were in danger of being overcrowded, and their highest usefulness, in a measure at least, impaired by the necessity of retaining and properly caring for children long after the age when they might be placed safely in private families. * * * The founders of our organization felt that that good work should be supplemented by an earnest effort on the part of good Catholic families to open up to these children, already trained and instructed, the avenues that lead to employment and self-support.

The Catholic Children's Aid Association of New Jersey was organized in 1903. In five years it has placed 458 children in foster homes and 789 children in homes of relatives. Its record for 1908 is 105 children placed in foster homes and 225 in homes of relatives, a total of 330. The association acts as the agent of nine institutions for children. It expended last year \$6,900. There is a splendid spirit of enthusiasm and thoroughness. The association is growing in public confidence and good will.

In Boston a Catholic organization has been established to find homes for Catholic children but its work has not yet reached the same development with the societies in New York and New Jersey.

A small Catholic Home Bureau has been organized and is at work in Milwaukee.

It is not too much to hope that by further development along the same line the existing orphan asylums will prove sufficient for future needs without creating new establishments.

The great mother church will solve this problem with the same wisdom and fidelity which she has brought to the successful solution of many of the great problems of philanthropy. It seems providential that this delicate and difficult task should have fallen into the hands of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, which carries into the work of philanthropy that personal touch and that sense of individual responsibility for the individual which is the essential element in any right system of placing in the family homes.

Wisconsin, 1902—The Lutheran Movement.

The German Lutheran Church developed a strong system of orphan asylums. For several years some of the leaders of that church had been watching the work of the Children's Home Society. As a result, in 1902 they organized the Lutheran Kinderfreund in Wisconsin and began placing children in family homes. A large Lutheran orphanage in Wisconsin was soon emptied of its children and transformed into a school. The kinderfreund movement has spread rapidly until there are now 14 societies operating in as many States, under the auspices of the German Lutheran Church. These societies are carried on under a simple and inexpensive plan and are already accomplishing a large work.

The Scandinavian Lutherans have recently started a similar movement. It would seem very desirable that all of the Lutheran bodies should unite in this movement rather than to multiply small organizations of similar faith operating in the same territory.

Cincinnati, 1899—Close of the Child-placing Controversy.

For twenty-five years a vigorous and sometimes warm discussion was waged in the National Conference of Charities and Correction between those who advocated the institutional plan of bringing up children to manhood and womanhood in orphan asylums, industrial schools, etc., and the advocates of the placing-out system of bringing up children in selected family homes. This discussion continued up to the year 1899, when it was practically closed by the epoch-making report of the committee on the care of destitute and neglected children, which was prepared and presented by the Hon. Thomas M. Mulry, president of the St. Vincent de Paul Society of New York, to whom belongs the honor of speaking the final word on this long controversy and laying down a platform which has been accepted with practical unanimity by Protestants, Jews, and Roman Catholics, managers of children's institutions, and managers of children's societies alike.

In the early years of this discussion there was sharp division. Advocates of the institutional plan charged that children placed in family homes were treated like slaves; that they were given out recklessly to almost anyone who would receive them; that many of them were practically abandoned by those who placed them out, and that many were found in reform schools and grew up to be criminals.

On the other hand, advocates of the placing-out system denounced institutions in unsparing terms. Some went so far as to declare that the worst home was better than the best institution, others declared that institutions for dependent children were entirely unnecessary and that all such children could be cared for in family homes.

The discussion went on from year to year. Advocates of the institutional plan showed the advantage of being able to control the child's environment, his sanitary conditions, his intellectual, physical, religious training, and security against the contaminating influences of the street. They pointed to the abuses practiced upon children bound to avaricious farmers and penurious housewives.

The advocates of the placing-out system emphasized the advantages of home life, with its free and natural atmosphere, and with the care and training of selected foster parents. They urged the disadvantages of "Institutionalism," the artificial environment and its unfavorable effect upon the initiative, independence, and force of the child. They dwelt upon the contamination which inevitably arises from massing children in large numbers and grew enthusiastic over the financial saving to the benevolent incident to the use of the family home instead of the institutions.

As years went on the two opposing factions gradually came together. The advocates of the institutional plan came to recognize its disadvantages and limitations. Institutions like the Cleveland Protestant Orphan Asylum and the Catholic Orphan Asylums of Minnesota began placing their children in homes, and orphan asylums gradually tended to become temporary refuges for children. On the other hand, the advocates of placing out children came to recognize the legitimate work of the institutions in preparing children who had been neglected for family life. Most of the placing-out societies established temporary homes for this purpose, and thus became themselves institutional people, and were not longer in a position to indulge in indiscriminate criticism of institutions.

Signs of harmony were visible at the great New York conference in 1898, but it was left for Hon. Thomas M. Mulry to bring the two opposing wings into harmony at Cincinnati in 1899, and his report has become one of the classics of the national conference of charities and correction.

Washington, 1909—The present situation.

I am sure that I speak the sentiments of those present when I say that we need not waste time in this assembly in discussing the question whether we favor the placing of children in family homes. We all favor it.

The questions which we are to discuss here are: How far is the placing-out system available for the dependent and delinquent children who come under our care? How can the institutions best use this plan: By employing agents of their own, or by using the societies which are specially organized for this form of work? What standards of selecting homes, visiting, and supervising children should be maintained? How far should the State undertake this work, and what, if any, supervision should be maintained by the State over private placing-out agencies?

The placing-out method has come to stay. It is for us to establish such high ideals and standards as are demanded by the sacredness of a work which undertakes to lay hold upon a child, absolutely helpless and dependent, and to determine his whole future without his volition or acquiescence. That is no light responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, before the next speaker begins I wish to ask the audience to wait for a few minutes when he has finished, so as to permit the secretary to make an announcement for to-morrow. I now take great pleasure in introducing to you Dr. Booker T. Washington, who will speak to you on "Destitute Colored Children of the South."

ADDRESS OF DR. BOOKER T. WASHINGTON, PRESIDENT TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE.

Doctor WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with a great deal of interest to what has been said, both this afternoon and this evening, and I find that most, if not all, of what you have said will apply in some degree to my own race. In fact, as I have heard these addresses I thought of a little experience that I witnessed some time ago in Montgomery, Ala.

It used to be the custom there, as I think it is now, that when the trains start out in the morning, bound for New York, it is the duty of the Pullman car porter to stand near the head of the train and call out the various stations through which the train will pass. So one morning they put on a new porter, and the old porter at the head of the train yelled out: "This train will pass through Atlanta, Charlotte, Danville, Lynchburg, Charlottesville, Washington, and New York." The new porter, not being able to remember all of those places, yelled out: "Just the same at this end, too." [Laughter.]

Now, as to most of what has been said and the main principles laid down, I think I can say with that new Pullman car porter in regard to my race: "Just the same at this end, too."

I shall speak to you for a few minutes mainly concerning the members of my race, in relation to this subject, as it relates to them in the southern portion of the United States, where the great body of our people live. It is to be kept in mind that the negro of the South is, for the most part, a rural population. I think I am safe in saying that 85 per cent of our people in the Southern States are to be found outside of the larger cities and towns.

While the negro has his vices and his disappointments, he also has his virtues and his encouragements. In studying the negro as a race, especially as you find him in his normal, regular life in the rural districts of the South, you will find that the negro, for the most part, is not a degraded human being. He may be an ignorant human being so far as books are concerned; but there is a great difference between degradation and pure simple ignorance. [Applause.]

From that point of view the problem is, in a large degree, encouraging. You will find, too, if you have studied the negro and noticed his life, that, as a rule, he is not a beggar. It is very seldom that, in the South or in the North, and especially is it true in the South, that you find a black hand reached out from the corner of the street asking for charity from anybody; and wherever you find a negro asking for alms in the Southern States, in nine cases out of ten you will find

him on the highway of travel between the North and Florida, where somebody has spoiled him in that respect. The negro does not often beg, and neither does he starve. [Laughter.] You have heard of starving Russians, and starving Armenians, and starving Japanese, and starving Jews; but nobody ever heard of a starving black man in America. He is a peculiar individual in that respect. He lives and can live in more climes and circumstances and in more climates and under more different conditions than any other human being that exists.

But I find, in studying his condition carefully, that the negro, for the most part, is best off in the country districts, and best off in the country districts of our southern country. [Applause.]

Growing largely out of the reasons to which I have referred, you will be surprised to know that the number of dependents among my own race in America is relatively small as compared with the number of dependents among the white population.

I heard a gentleman state a few moments ago that the State of Massachusetts alone pays over \$600,000 annually toward the care and support of the dependents in that State. Why, my friends, I guarantee that the most careful and rigid examination into the facts would reveal that which I think is true—that that is more money than is spent for the dependent negro children in the whole southern country.

I think you will find that the latest statistics show that in the whole United States there are about 31,000 negro dependent children in institutions of all kinds. The total negro population of Alabama is about 900,000, and out of the total population of 900,000 I find that, according to our most recent reports in Alabama, there are 301 children in institutions for the care of the dependent—301 out of a total population of about 900,000.

In fact, this subject of the care of dependent children with us who reside in the rural districts of the South is so new and so little discussed that I confess I never looked into it very carefully from your point of view until after I received the invitation to come to this meeting. When I received the invitation I said at once that I would look about me and see what was going on in my own county—in Macon County—which is largely a rural and farming county. On making an examination I found that there were 23,000 people of my race in that county. I went at once to an institution about 9 miles from our institute, for the care of dependents of both races in that county, and I made an examination. I went to the superintendent, who had been in charge of that institution for eight years, and got what information I could from him.

In the first place, I found that during the past four years there had been an average of only six dependents of any age in this institution of my race—only six in four years of any age. I found, when I made my visit last week, that there was not a single negro dependent of any age in that institution.

The county authorities there will admit the members of my race fairly and they will extend to them the same care in Macon County that they will extend to the people of their own race. The dependents of my race are not kept out by reason of any special discrimination against them or because they are not wanted. I will explain to you later why they are not there.

I found, further, that not only was there not a single dependent there at the present time, but I found by investigating the record that during the past eight years there had been in that institution only one negro child, and the superintendent told me that this child went there because his grandmother was taken there and the little fellow cried and he was humored to the extent of being taken there with her. As soon as his grandmother died the superintendent said that some strange woman came there and begged the privilege of taking that child home and making him a part of her family. Since that time we have not had a negro dependent in that institution. Remember, that is out of a total negro population of 23,000 in our county.

You may suggest that this is an unusual condition, existing perhaps by reason of the influence of the Tuskegee Institute. That may have something to do with it; but very little, I think. I hope that our good friend who is the leader of this movement in Alabama will speak to you about this subject, and I am quite sure that he will bear out the statements I am trying to emphasize.

You will find that in other counties where there is no Tuskegee Institute much the same conditions prevail.

This condition exists because, as you will find, the negro, in some way, has inherited and has had trained into him the idea that he must take care of his own dependents, and he does it to a greater degree than is true, perhaps, of any other race in the same relative stage of civilization. Why, my friends, in our ordinary southern communities we look upon it as a disgrace for an individual to be permitted to be taken from that community to any kind of an institution for dependents. [Applause.]

I do not know of any case in my own experience where the parents of children have died but what within a few hours, almost before the breath has passed from the body of the parent, one neighbor, sometimes two, three, and sometimes half a dozen have appeared on the scene and begged the privilege of taking this child and that child into their own families. You will find the same to be true in reference to sick people and to the unfortunate of all classes. They are cared for by individuals in the community. They are cared for through their churches. We have not got so far along yet in civilization that we do not think it is a part of the duty of the church to take care of the sick people of the community. [Applause.] They are cared for more largely in recent years through the various secret organizations, of which we have so many.

You hear a great deal about these secret organizations, but you do not know how many we have. I spent a week or ten days in Mississippi recently, and if there is a negro man, woman, or child in the whole State of Mississippi who does not belong to one or more secret organizations I did not find him. These organizations have their humorous side, perhaps, and their useless side; but they also have their valuable side, that of teaching our people how to take care of the dependents of their own race, among others.

It is only as the negro is brought into contact with an artificial civilization and newer surroundings, as he leaves his normal, regular, and best life in the South, in my opinion, and comes into contact with the artificial life of the city and especially with the artificial life of your northern cities, that this condition is changed.

Charity workers—I do not like the word. I am not a charity worker. I am in business the same as anybody else, and I do not like anybody to call me a charity worker, because I do not beg, even. I ask people if they have got money to invest, and talk to them as though they were investing money in the Pennsylvania Railroad, or any other corporation that is to help the country.

But, my friends, those of you who have the privilege and opportunity, and many of you will have the privilege and opportunity, of observing my race and the children of my race, I beg of you to exert that influence in keeping the negro on the soil, in keeping him close in touch with Mother Earth, in keeping him out of contact with the temptations and complications and the artificial influences of your large-city life. Just in proportion as that is done you will find that many of these problems you are discussing in such an interesting manner will not disturb you so far as the negro race is concerned.

The very minute a negro leaves the South and comes to a place like Washington, Baltimore, or New York he hears, in some roundabout way, that there is a fund somewhere, which grows in importance and amounts up into the thousands of dollars. He gets the idea that this fund is meant to support all the poor people, and the hard-working people, and every person who gets into trouble, and he usually gets his part of that fund. He knows how to get it, and in proportion as he is brought into contact with this artificial life, this new life, in that proportion he loses the spirit of simplicity, the spirit of helpfulness which he had before he came into the city environments.

I repeat that, in the negro's present condition of inexperience and lack of strength in many matters, that you should use your influence, wherever you can, to keep him on the soil in the rural districts, and especially in the rural districts of our southern country.

As I have suggested, the negro has been putting into practice the very ideas you have been emphasizing all through this afternoon and evening. He has been putting into practice more largely than any other race in America in the same relative stage of civilization, the principles which you have been talking about to-day.

Now as to the influence of institutional life upon the negro: I strongly advocate, as I have already suggested, the keeping of the individual negro child in the individual family. I have had some experiences in connection with asylums of various kinds and with institutions that are organized for the care of dependent children of my race, and my observation and experience, so far as it concerns my people, is this: I find that in many cases the child would be better off if left to chance to get into some home than he is in the average orphan asylum. We have at Tuskegee many individuals and many students who come to us from the orphan asylums. We used to have more than we have now; but we have learned something in recent years that we did not know then, so that we have still fewer now. We have looked with suspicion upon any boy or girl that comes to us from an orphan asylum. In fact, I happen to know of a case with reference to one of our most widely advertised orphan asylums. One morning, when I happened to be in this institution, I learned that a previous night a number of the boys had got together and broken open the cupboard and got out the pies; the pies had disappeared overnight. The next morning the good woman—she was

one of these good-hearted creatures—called these boys in and had special prayer with them. [Laughter.]

The difficulty is that the large proportion of the people who organize these institutions for the care of negro children are wanting in executive business ability. They are good people, sentimental people, and the best people on earth, and they want to do everything for everybody. Those are the people who usually start an orphan asylum first of all. In many other cases I have found that many of these institutions are started, primarily, with a view to finding a job for a superintendent or somebody else, and not with a view to helping the negro child. [Applause.]

And so in this way or that way I have learned, my friends, to become very suspicious of the average orphan asylum, organized and built up for the support of the members of my race. It pays far better to use our time and our influence and our money, if we have it, to keep the negro in the country, in the natural environment, until he gets the strength and experience which has made your race great and strong and useful.

My friends, I heard one speaker refer to-day to the sacrifice that such people as compose this gathering are making. I am not a very old man; but the longer I live and the more experience I have in life, the more I am convinced that the only thing that is worth living for and worth dying for, if necessary, is the opportunity and privilege of making some human being more happy and more useful. I have never made a sacrifice in my life. Some people refer to me as making sacrifices for my race; but I never made a sacrifice for my race, for any race. I always pity, from the bottom of my heart, the man who has learned to live for himself, and I envy the man who has learned to live for somebody else. The further down we can reach in the saving of these little human beings, these dependent children, the higher up are we ourselves lifted into the Christ atmosphere. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The secretary will now make the announcement.

The SECRETARY. I have been requested by the chairman of the banquet committee to say that if any persons in this room desire an opportunity of hearing the excellent list of speakers for the banquet to-morrow night at 7.30 in this room, he will be very glad to have them secure tickets in the mezzanine parlor after this meeting. The banquet will be served promptly at 7.30 o'clock. The speakers include Miss Lillian D. Wald, Mr. Mornay Williams, Rev. Francis H. Gavis, Hon. James R. Garfield, Hon. Herman A. Metz, Hon. Ben B. Lindsey, and Hon. Julian W. Mack, and the closing remarks will be by the President of the United States.

Those of you who have asked to have tickets reserved, and there are about 75 reservations, will not be able to get tickets later than to-morrow morning at 9 o'clock. If you do not take up your reservation before that time, it will be too late. If the members of the conference want to be present to-morrow night, it is essential that they should secure tickets either to-night or to-morrow morning. The tickets are \$3 each.

(The conference thereupon adjourned until Tuesday morning at 9.30 o'clock, in the board room of the district building.)

BOARD ROOM, DISTRICT BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Tuesday, January 26, 1909—9.30 a. m.

The conference was called to order by Hon. Julian W. Mack.

The CHAIRMAN. Hon. H. B. F. Macfarland will say a word of greeting.

ADDRESS OF HON. H. B. F. MACFARLAND, COMMISSIONER OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

MR. MACFARLAND. I fear that you may think we are greeting you too often, but if it makes you feel perfectly at home I shall not be sorry.

I want to say especially that it is a particular pleasure to have you in our district government building, as this is the first time we have had such a conference here. The building was only opened on the 4th of July last, and it is very gratifying to us to have you honor us with your presence and to have you give historic interest and association to the new building.

I regret deeply, as I said yesterday, that we are in the midst of our conference with the Senate Committee on Appropriations on our district budget for next year; so I shall not be able to return for the sessions throughout to-day, but I hope to be able to be with you later.

I thank you very much. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The first matter of business this morning is the discussion of topic No. 5, on which the papers of last night were primarily based. The secretary will please read the question.

The SECRETARY (reading):

Should children normal in mind and body, and not requiring special training, who must be removed from their own homes, be cared for in families, wherever practicable?

The CHAIRMAN. The subject is now open for discussion, ladies and gentlemen. Let me recall to your mind the five-minute rule, and also the observation of the preceding sessions that when you rise to speak you give your name and State.

MR. JAMISON. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Jamison.

ADDRESS OF MR. A. T. JAMISON, GREENWOOD, S. C., SUPERINTENDENT, CONNIE MAXWELL ORPHANAGE.

MR. JAMISON. It is realized and granted by all that feeble-minded children, the incorrigibles, and special classes should have the training that the institution alone can successfully provide. It must also be recognized that the drift of intelligent sentiment among students of the children's problems in this country is toward the idea that the normal child should be placed in a family home rather than in an institution.

Let us, however, not be forgetful of the fact that conditions differ in various parts of our land and that a single iron-clad rule can not be made perfectly to fit every section. Most of the discussions in conferences of this character relate to the child of the city, and unquestionably his situation thrusts upon us some problems that have come to be acute. Taking the home-finding agencies as they are conducted and the institutions as they are conducted to-day, and perhaps most persons agree that the dependent normal child is far better off if removed from the poverty and narrowness of urban squalor into an open country home amidst broad acres and glorious pure air.

But I would direct your attention to some conditions that appear so to qualify these admissions as to forbid the adoption of a hard-and-fast rule upon the subject. In one of our States, for example, the population is 85 per cent rural, and the large city, as well as the foreigner, is unknown. The towns and smaller cities do not present the horrible conditions of congestion and such other ills as are found in the great cities.

In these agricultural sections the school term is usually very short, often no longer than four months in the year, and the quality of instruction given is not of the best. There operates no compulsory-education law, and the school attendance is therefore go as you please. In many cases the standard of living in the homes is not high, and the intelligence of the people is not elevated. A child placed in most of these country homes would not have the advantages that he would get in an institution, and is likely to grow up with little education and without the higher ideals of life. In these portions of our country, at least, the institution is needed, with its ten months' school, orderly arrangement of work, and instruction in industrial training.

There are certain sections in which many a child almost in his teens is left destitute and orphan while yet unable to read and write, and 90 per cent of the applications that are received seeking help for destitute children are from the country. To children of this class it is a godsend to find a place in a well-conducted institution and not in one of these average homes where the standard of intelligence is below normal.

The institution is a quickening influence to the country child.

Many of the institutions in these sections are doing a noble work by putting emphasis on two words, namely, the home and the school. They are nearly all established in the country, organized on the cottage plan, conducted by the religious denominations, in each case supported enthusiastically by a loyal constituency, and the expression "orphan asylum" has been dropped from their nomenclature. These institutions are not refuges, but orphan homes for the care and education of the child until he is fitted for self-support.

Let us not discount the institution, because its work for the normal child in some sections, at least, is meeting the conditions sympathetically and intelligently.

The CHAIRMAN. The topic under discussion, ladies and gentlemen, is No. 5—

Should children normal in mind and body and not requiring special training, who must be removed from their own homes, be cared for in families wherever practicable.

For the benefit of those who have just come, I will say that the matter is open for discussion. It was the subject-matter of the papers of last night.

**ADDRESS OF DR. EDWARD T. DEVINE, OF NEW YORK CITY,
EDITOR CHARITIES AND THE COMMONS, ETC.**

MR. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, in reference to the point that has just been made, I should like to say one word. I have heard it brought forward in my own State of New York as a reason why children should not be placed in country homes that district schools are not as good as they should be. That is practically the point of this objection, as I understand it, coupled with the further suggestion that the homes are not as good as they should be.

Now, without considering how far that may be a reason for using institutions rather than country homes, I should like to suggest that when people realize that country schools are not as good as they should be, and they are interested in finding country homes for children, they could draw either of two conclusions, just as in the case of people who want to ride a bicycle or want to drive an automobile. If they find that the country roads are not good, they could draw either of two conclusions, either that they will not ride in automobiles, or that they will not ride bicycles, or that they will throw their influence in favor of getting good roads. As a matter of fact, the bicycle and the automobile, as we all know, have been powerful influences in the getting of good roads.

I am inclined to think that the interested people who are concerned about the welfare of dependent children may exercise a powerful influence in actually getting good country schools, just as the automobile and the bicycle have had an influence in the getting of good country roads.

In other words, it will be a great thing, I think, if there shall go out from this conference an expression of determination that merely because it is necessary to find country homes for the children, therefore the people who are interested in child-saving work as a whole will be interested in having good country schools. That is a thing in which many people are interested, and if to those influences there can be added such an influence as this representing the child-saving work as a whole, I can not think but that it will have a powerful influence in raising the standard of country schools, and often, perhaps, in raising the standard of country homes. [Applause.]

**REMARKS OF MR. W. B. SHERRARD, OF SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
SUPERINTENDENT NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY, ETC.**

MR. SHERRARD. In the newer States of the West we have a better opportunity to demonstrate our theories than you have in the older States that have established institutions. For this reason, I desire to call your attention to conditions as they exist in South Dakota, and the same is applicable to some of the neighboring States.

We have not in South Dakota—and I want you to note what I say—we have not a child on a poor farm, and we have not a child in an orphanage, except in an orphanage belonging to one branch of the Norwegian Lutheran Church. We have not a child in the custody of vicious or immoral parents whose immorality can be proven in court. We have about 1,400 children in family homes.

The public look upon our work with such a degree of approval that in the past ninety days we have received from public voluntary contributions enough to run us for a year. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Judge George W. Atkinson, of West Virginia, has the floor.

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE W. ATKINSON, OF WEST VIRGINIA, PRESIDENT WEST VIRGINIA CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

MR. ATKINSON. I speak from experience, I think, when I say that I believe it is far better for homeless children to be placed in individual homes than it is to mass them together in children's homes.

Some fourteen years ago we established in West Virginia a Children's Home Society. During this period we have been finding homes in which there are no children, and we have been placing homeless children in those homes. We have, during these fourteen years, placed about 400 children.

While I think it is the best plan to find an individual home for the child, because it grows up under conditions which enable it to get proper conceptions of home life, which the child can not get in children's homes, yet there are types of children, as President Roosevelt said yesterday, that you can not care for in individual homes. Therefore, it is necessary, perhaps, to have one or more children's homes in each of the States. We now have two or three in our State. We have a reform school, and very often we get hold of a boy whom we can not control. If we place him in a home and he proves a failure, we replace him. If he is a failure there, he is classed as incorrigible, and we send that boy to a reform school, where he is educated and controlled properly, and endeavor to make something out of him there.

We also have in our State a girls' reform school, or, as it is technically called, an industrial home, where girls are cared for who are incorrigible and who can not well be managed in individual homes.

I believe most heartily that we should encourage as far as possible the establishment or organization of children's home societies, such as we now have, I think, in 29 States of the Union, and that they should all work along the same lines. I believe—indeed, I know in my own State, as I have been president of the organization since it was first established—that it is a success. There is no question about that. Hence we should encourage this plan of caring for homeless children as vigorously and as earnestly as we possibly can in every section of the Republic. The good work should never be allowed to cease.

We have no trouble in obtaining all the necessary aids to keep our society running in my State of West Virginia. It costs us about \$6,000 a year, and that amount is given to us by charitable men and women, often without the asking, in order that this work may be kept going. Ex-Senator Henry G. Davis, a noble and most lovable personage, and a man who is doing a great deal of good in many ways, has given our society a building containing about twenty rooms as a temporary shelter, where we keep on hand eight or ten or a dozen children until we can find homes for them. He also gives us \$100 a month with which to help meet the running expenses and has provided for it to go on forever, I hope, as he is now an old man. He has generously provided for us, and the balance of the money which we need for current expenses is always forthcoming, so that the work is progressing most admirably, and I feel sure that the society will go on in its noble work through all coming time. [Applause.]

**REMARKS OF MRS. J. L. ANDERSON, REPRESENTING THE CHILDREN'S
AID SOCIETY OF WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA.**

Mrs. ANDERSON. I wish to say that the Children's Aid Society of Western Pennsylvania does not believe in institutions. For the last twenty years we have been carrying on this work of finding homes for children in families, which we believe is the God-given plan for taking care of these children. But we were compelled twelve years ago to open an institution, called an industrial school, at Indiana, Pa. We sometimes get a child who is not fit to go into any home. You would not take it into yours, and I would not take it into mine. A child of this kind is placed in this school, where for half the day it is in school under a careful teacher and the balance of the time it has domestic training.

Then, we find homes for the girls. Sometimes a mother comes to us with a child that she says she can not control. She asks us what she can do. We send her to this school, and in a few months that child can be returned to the mother, or placed in some good home, because it has been under proper discipline, which probably it has not received in its own home.

Then, again, we sometimes receive from the juvenile court children who are really not morally bad, and the court probation officers do not want to put them in the detention rooms. We place these children in this school, and in a short time they can be returned very much improved.

During the past year we cared for 1,385 children in various ways. Of these 274 were cared for in boarding homes (carefully selected), 82 in hospitals, 213 returned to friends, 31 adopted, 19 were married, and 16 reached their majority. Passed from care, 314; mothers assisted in their homes, 179; died during the year, 33 (mostly infants); visits made in the interest of the work, 3,111.

**REMARKS OF DR. RUDOLPH R. REEDER, OF HASTINGS UPON HUDSON,
N. Y., SUPERINTENDENT NEW YORK ORPHANAGE, ETC.**

Doctor REEDER. It seems to me that it would throw a great deal of light on this question if we had more data as to the outcome of this work. Yesterday and to-day, we have heard a great many delegates say "The society I represent has 500 children placed in families," another 1,400, another 1,200, and so forth. We have had a good many statements of that kind, all of which are interesting; but it would be still more interesting as well as of much more practical worth if we had some data as to the outcome of such work—how many of these children were placed a second time, how many a third time, and how many a fourth time; what was the average tenure of stay in each home for the whole number placed during a period of years; what is the average amount of schooling given these children; what attainments in education were acquired by them, etc.

If there is any such data as that on hand, it seems to me it would throw much more light on this question than simply to talk about proper distribution. It is easy to distribute children; it is not easy to give them the training that they should have.

Perhaps there is somebody here to-day who can give us at least some of these facts.

REMARKS OF REV. C. EISSFELDT, OF WAUWATOSA, WIS., GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT LUTHERAN KINDERFREUND SOCIETIES.

Mr. EISSFELDT. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, in my connection with the home-finding work of the Lutheran Church, which we started twelve years ago, I have gained some experience in this work; in addition to that, while a pastor in Chicago, I had particular chance of getting acquainted with institution work, as our church had an orphan asylum near Chicago, I being at that time on the board of the institution.

To answer these questions that have just been asked, I will say that we place from 60 to 80 children at present in Wisconsin in our home-finding work each year, and the average of replacing in the last three or four or five years, while we have been placing that number, is nine; we replace about nine children on an average throughout the year.

Now, although we are quite fortunate in regard to compulsory education in Wisconsin, I admit that we have some homes where the amount of school education is not as much as, for instance, in the institution near Chicago; still the education for life is there, the main education, the education of the family home, which is not and can not be obtained in any institution.

While connected with our orphan home near Chicago, I have noticed that the children that were turned out there when they were given to people—I can not say foster parents, because they were given out on wages—were put out into a world that was a strange world to them. They did not know what life was. They knew what the life was in the orphan home, but that was not life as it really is, not the life to which they were born.

I would like to refer to one extreme example which we had in Wisconsin. As was said last night, we closed our orphan home in Wisconsin years ago, and have not been obliged to open another one. I remember taking a 15-year-old girl from that orphans' home, or having her taken by my agent, and placed in a home. About a month later I was asked to call at the home where the girl had been placed, as there was something to be straightened out; and when I called the people told me that the girl did not feel like doing anything else but peel potatoes. I was astonished. I spoke to the girl, and inquired what was the matter. She said, "That is what I did in the orphan home." As I say, this is an extreme example; but still it is a fact, it is no make-up. She had the idea that her duty in life was peeling potatoes. All her time was certainly taken up in the home with this work; there were 140 children there, for whom potatoes had to be peeled.

Now, I do not want to judge others, but from my experience in connection with the board of the orphan home, and in connection especially with my work now in Wisconsin and in other States where we have organized "kinderfreund" societies, I believe it is a crime against the child if I can give the child a father and mother, if I can give it family life, if I can give it a father's and mother's love, and say, "No; you shall stay in this institution until you are 14 and then go out into a strange world." From my experience, I should judge that I would commit a crime, a crime that cries to heaven, against the child if I did that. [Applause.]

**REMARKS OF MISS JOSEPHINE M. GRISWOLD, OF HARTFORD, CONN.,
SECRETARY CONNECTICUT CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.**

Miss GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, we have not done very much in Connecticut for a State that lies so near to that remarkable State of Massachusetts; it would seem that we ought to have made much more progress in the work of child saving than we have.

We have a great many institutions in Connecticut, and I wish we had not so many. We have a half dozen or more orphan asylums, and we have eight county homes, and I was quite struck last night with what I heard concerning the abandonment of those county homes in the West. I think it was in Indiana or one of those States in the West, and the speaker said Connecticut was studying the problem now. We surely need to study it.

Twenty-five years ago we established county homes in Connecticut, but now they have departed from the original purpose.

We thought that if 25 or 35 children could be gathered together in those homes, it would be an easy matter to place them out. But the trouble with those homes is exactly the same as it is with other institutions—that as soon as we provide the institutions they will be filled. I think we are all agreed on that.

I want to add also that I trust the people interested in this work in Connecticut will make visits to Massachusetts, just as Doctor Hart has done, and gather from their almost complete plan some plan for Connecticut. I would recommend that to our Connecticut officials.

I want to say a word about the work of our own society in Connecticut, the Children's Aid Society. We have been placing children for the last seventeen years and we have no institution. We do not need any institution. We take the children as they come to us and put them into boarding homes, and just as fast as possible we find homes for them. We are trying to place as many children as possible in good family homes. We have a large boarding home in the country where we place a great many children to board and many other boarding homes, and as fast as we can we take them from their boarding homes and put them into private families.

I am sure that this is the only way to deal with the normal dependent children which we meet in the State of Connecticut. We hope the county homes will be depleted and in time abandoned. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF REV. J. P. DYSART, OF MILWAUKEE, WIS., SUPERINTENDENT OF THE CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN.

Mr. DYSART. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, Mr. Eissfeldt and I are both delegates from Wisconsin, and our society is the parent of his society.

I have had an experience of twenty years in child-placing work, and I want to emphasize one thing in connection with the introduction of this work among the Lutheran churches. I want to emphasize one feature in connection with the home-finding work at the orphanage at Wittenberg, Wis., where this homing work on the part of the Lutheran church began. They had about 125 children there. It was an average orphan asylum, and they began to place their children out under the careful supervision of Mr. Eissfeldt. In the course of time (some three years) they closed the institution and turned it into an academy. The point I want to make is this: We are meeting often

with the statement that there is a large percentage of unplaceables gathered in institutions. The percentage of unplaceables in Wittenberg was zero; they placed every child. [Applause.]

So I am led to believe, sir, that where there is a will there is a way. Now, not only do we in our work place out what are called placeable children, carefully and well, but we are breaking into the ranks of the defective children. My society has found a splendid home for a boy with a wooden leg. We have placed a child with a blind eye, and he is greatly beloved. We have placed a half dozen with club feet.

I think the time is rapidly coming, as the sympathies of the people grow larger and the hearts of the people who love children become warmer, when it will not only be possible to place a good many defectives, but also a good many of the class that we now call delinquents.

I am quite in sympathy with the idea of Judge Lindsey, that there are no bad "kids" (though there are many bad parents), and a great many of the children who are now styled delinquents can, with time and patience and the growing sentiment of love toward children and a desire to make them good citizens, be homed and mothered. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. B. PICKMAN MANN, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., PRESIDENT OF BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the first speaker this morning referred to States in which nearly every one lives in the country, and where there are poor schools, and for that reason he seemed to think that we should have institutions to bring up these children.

Now, it should be considered that the children are only to remain in the institution a short length of time and then they are to go out into the community. Now, children should not be so brought up that when they go into the community they will find themselves out of harmony with the community. I believe that if the community as a whole is in a poor condition it is doing an injury to the child to put him in a condition so that when he goes into the community he is not able to fit into it. He will feel that he is better than the rest and will not be willing to take his part, but instead will turn to a criminal or useless life.

The present subject of discussion is in regard to normal children, and therefore the consideration of institutions as places where abnormal children should be placed, even if it is for no other purpose than to prepare them for a home, is out of the line of this question. It seems to me that when we consider normal children the idea of taking such children and putting them in abnormal relations, as are the relations of institutions, is certainly bad.

I think there is no doubt as to the answer to this question. If the child is normal, why should you take him and put him in an abnormal place?

The experience of the Board of Children's Guardians of the District of Columbia has been that in many cases the first placement was not quite satisfactory, and we had to make other placements; but that is no reason why we should not make the beginning. If we waited until we got a perfect child and a perfect home, we would probably never place a child anywhere; but we find that by using reasonable

precaution we can place most of our children the first time so that they will stay, and if they will not stay we learn something as to the characteristics of the children usually, and possibly we get some warning as to the character of the home; so that we know better next time how to place the children right.

At least 75 per cent of our children are placed out in homes, and although they are not all free homes, yet we may consider that placing children at board is not like our hunting for board for ourselves. If I do not want to keep house I go to a house where I can board, and it does not make very much difference who the other people are there if they are decent; but if we want to find a good home for a child, we may find one where the people are not able to carry the whole burden of taking care of the child. Therefore we subsidize them to some extent; but that is not by any means placing children out at board in the ordinary sense of the words.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the duty of the chairman, under the rules, to secure the discussion of both the affirmative and the negative of every question. I should be glad to recognize as the next speaker somebody who would want to emphasize the difficulties and the dangers that confront home finding, and particularly the dangers and difficulties and, if he so considers it, the impossibility of finding proper homes for the older children. Somebody who will speak on that side of the question will be given the preference now.

REMARKS OF MR. RICHARD CRANE, OF CINCINNATI, OHIO, SECRETARY PARTICULAR COUNCIL ST. VINCENT DE PAUL SOCIETY OF CINCINNATI, ETC.

Mr. CRANE. In whatever I should say upon this question, I would not wish to be understood as excluding the State from the great work of charity in which it can so efficiently cooperate. But if we consider the large variety of agencies that may be useful in protecting and educating dependent children, many difficulties occur to mind that would make it a matter of serious consideration as to the manner in which the State might act and the means which it might use.

First of all, we have the already well-established charities instituted and with considerable success carried out by various minor organizations amongst us. Foremost, probably, are those undertaken by the various religious bodies. There are also notable private endowments by philanthropic men and women. Most of these, I have no doubt, in one way or the other are chartered institutions, and as such are supposed to carry on their work with the approval and knowledge of the Commonwealth in which they labor.

There are also societies whose endeavor it is to find homes in which the homeless child may be reared unto the perfection of good manhood and good citizenship. But when we consider the nature of these two great agencies for good the problem of supervision, as far as the child is concerned, becomes hard of solution, if we would maintain the proper distinction between the State and the minor societies of individuals whose rights the State must be supposed to protect.

Let us recall to mind, briefly, the well-defined relations which nature itself has placed between different societies. The State is a society, perfectly adapted to secure its proper end. So is the church.

So is the family. And so all other organizations, each in its proper sphere, down to the lowest, where objects and ends are of the most trivial, though to a degree useful, for civilized man.

It seems to be a principle of good government not to interfere in the direction, at least immediate, of matters which specifically belong by nature to other duly constituted bodies. There are some which are really subordinate to the State, inasmuch as they have no particular end of their own save some detail which belongs properly to the general end of the State itself, viz, the external common good to be obtained in our present life and the protection of civil rights common to us all. There are, moreover, organizations complete in themselves which, if they do not depart from their specific functions, can not possibly, in pursuance of them, cause any detriment to the common welfare. As long as such organizations keep within their proper sphere it can hardly be possible that the State can wish to direct them in obtaining the common good, unless their very charter be obnoxious to it. The family, for instance, in the bringing up and educating of children, is furnished intrinsically with all the necessary means for the obtaining of its own object. Where it does so, there can be no question of its natural rights and legitimacy. Religion, too, that does not offend against the natural law has within itself all the means it requires to obtain its high purpose, and while it remains within its scope can hardly be considered subordinate to any State.

Chartered institutions are, by the fact of their charter, in cooperation with the State to the obtaining of the particular and common end of both.

With these preliminary remarks understood, it would seem unnecessary for the State to bother itself with the internal economy of such bodies as long as the effects of their work are not calculated to impede or to destroy the general well-being.

These are very general principles, indeed, but they rest upon the wholesome principles laid down by our forefathers, "that all men by nature are free and equal."

And societies—that is, genuine societies—are but modeled on the moral unity and responsibility of the human being itself. That the State must watch its own interests, whether the danger of aggression be from individuals or societies, there is no one who can deny. But there is no need for this purpose to investigate the means or methods that are internal to the individual, or to that imitation of the individual (a society), and which they may think to use for the obtaining of their proper object, so long as it is within the law and the results are good.

If they are mistaken, it is not to the State they are responsible, but to a higher tribunal. If their means are inefficacious they will die a natural death; if their methods be fraudulent or scandalous the State will soon be able to deal with them as with any other criminals.

Now, while I can not speak for all manner of charitable organizations, I can adduce as example the working of the principal Catholic societies for the saving and protecting of youth. Their methods are the outgrowth of many centuries of experience; their means, generally the generosity of individuals. They are directly amenable to the church authorities, who inspect them with a minuteness that can be possible only in the spiritual order. If the State can trust a hierarchy so anxious to save its subjects, and especially its children, with the

management of its own family (as I may call it), there can be no need for inspection from those whose care should be only for the temporal welfare of all and the protection of the rights of every moral being or moral body within it until the civil order itself has been jeopardized.

I can readily understand and agree to the proposition that the State should wish to know, in some measure, what societies within her pale are doing; and I believe, too, that the State should wish all societies which come into contact with her labors for the welfare of her citizens should carry on their work under charter. Of course individual governments could be unfair in the giving of charters, but we have no right to suppose the case in our discussion here. Given the charter in which all points of contact with the State are considered, the State should leave her citizens or society to pursue its path untrammelled.

Looking at the practical side of it, I would deem it highly impracticable, nay socialistic, for the State to attempt the care of all dependent children. That it becomes the duty of the State to care for those who might properly be called orphans, or even waifs, is not altogether clear. However, that is not the question just at present. That it should cooperate is far clearer. But in cooperation there is not included the right to direct to the extent of asking an account of what may be done by those who transgress no just law.

As far as home-finding societies are concerned, it would be of little avail to inspect them. Rather should the inspection be of the homes they would find for the children. I suppose all will agree that such inspection would be well-nigh impossible.

If the foster parents should have families of their own, the difficulties that would probably beset the adopted child would not be readily manifested to any government inquiry. Nor would such a child's defense be very successful against those who might find some temporal advantage in keeping the child. If the fatherless one were taken by a childless couple, what inspection could we make here? And what would be their qualifications for rearing a child? More than those of the Sisters and nurses in institutions? Home does not consist in a couple that live in a house together, nor in a ward who has never excited in its would-be mother the yearning of flesh and blood.

Do not imagine that I oppose adoption—far from it—in a sense it is the most beautiful of this kind, that is, the saving of children. But here, too, how many difficulties beset us—religion, condition, environment, etc. And how would the State keep track of all these things? It seems to me that when distribution is made by the State, or by societies, they have to take it for granted that it was made wisely until events prove otherwise; or else undertake a costly and useless experiment of inspection which may fasten upon the State a burden which it would find hard to shake off.

Here, too, the State will have to trust its well-meaning citizens, without multiplying petty laws, which would make automatons of them.

I have not suggested any way out of the difficulty directly, but though we may not be able to find any one system which will be universally workable, we could perhaps see great good in many existing systems which the State could reasonably encourage and protect.

REMARKS OF MR. LUDWIG B. BERNSTEIN, OF NEW YORK CITY, SUPER-INTENDENT HEBREW SHELTERING GUARDIAN ORPHAN ASYLUM.

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, three years ago the institution of which I am superintendent, and which takes care of 750 children in the institution proper, started, with a great deal of enthusiasm, a boarding and placing-out bureau. To-day that bureau deals with 265 children. It has dealt during the past three or three and a half years with a total of 1,000 Jewish children on the boarding-out plan.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we have no axes of any kind to grind, and the remarks that I am going to make are dictated by a spirit of reverent search after truth. I must say that I have found poor homes, mediocre homes, good homes, and excellent homes, just as I have found "potato-peeling" institutions, good institutions, very good institutions, and institutions that are up-to-date in every respect. I have not yet found the boarding-out bureau to be a panacea, and this in spite of the fact that most modern methods are used and that the work is done with great enthusiasm.

It is only when you have one set of experiences to counterbalance the other set of experiences that you get at such a thing as an unbiased philosophy of the question.

I have found that with young children the boarding home is superior to the congregate institution. I have found this to be the case as expressed by medical examinations, expressed in the physical care, and in the physical attention given to the child, but I have also found that the average Jewish boarding home—and I should judge that what is true of the Jewish boarding home is largely true of the non-Jewish—is entirely inadequate for the older boy and the older girl—in fact, so inadequate that in a number of instances the foster parents brought the children back to me and told me they had had the children for the past three years, that during that time the children had been very good, but that now the children had outgrown the people from the point of view of moral and intellectual influence. I have never made a point of asking parents to return the children to me at a certain age; it came about in the most natural way.

Now, there is a philosophy to it. I was wondering what was the trouble. Surely, after a home had been found satisfactory for a period of two or three years, there was every reason to believe that such a boarding home might become a permanent home for the child. But I have found that unless the home represents a very much higher intellectual standard than the standard reached by the child through his educational development it becomes inadequate and not available for the Jewish child.

Furthermore, I have found, in connection with the same kind of work, that at a certain age in the life of a child the sense of companionship, the sense of good-fellowship, the sense of friendship, is very much stronger than that of filial devotion. Psychology teaches us that this is so at the age of 12 or 13 or 14 years, technically called the "pre-adolescent stage."

What are the forces that prompt the child—the boy and the girl—of that age? Is it love for the father and mother which becomes the supreme force in the child? Those who have dealt with thou-

sands of children in schools and in institutions know very well that at this particular age the greatest force in the child's life is not its love for father or mother, but it is the ideal friendships, the associations, the love of companionship which become of the greatest possible value. [Applause.]

**REMARKS OF MRS. MARTHA P. FALCONER, OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
SUPERINTENDENT GIRLS' HOUSE OF REFUGE.**

Mrs. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, I think most of us here believe in placing children in family homes, and we believe in placing them there young.

I wish we might hear more about supervision here, and having a standard of placing children in family homes, and not feel that we have done our duty by a child when we have placed that child—let us say a girl, just for a change. We place a girl 13 or 14 years of age with good people in the country—earnest, Christian people—and then we feel that we have done our whole duty by that child. We have not visited that child; the child has not been sent to school regularly as she should have been.

Let us talk, if we are going to talk about placing children in family homes, about the difficulties, and especially the difficulties of placing older children.

We may always be afraid—and I have found them both East and West—of young married people who come and want a strong, healthy girl to adopt. They want to take that child into their own family and treat her as their own. That sounds on the surface very beautiful. What does it usually mean? It usually means they want cheap labor. They want to adopt her so that no one may come to visit. They want that child to do the work for them. Is that child now in school? Is that child visited? Are we doing our duty?

It is exceedingly difficult to place older children. I have now with me one girl who was placed in 28 different homes before she came to me, and it was a matter of surprise to her that she was not placed in the twenty-ninth right away when she became disagreeable. By being moved on and moved on and moved on, if that girl was not pauperized, I don't know who was. The placing of the older girls, the older children, is a very much more difficult matter, as we want more supervision.

Then, too, we come together year after year, and I am sure most people are interested in placing children in family homes, but we heard last night from Booker Washington how many of the colored people feel called upon to open orphan asylums. Unfortunately, that is not confined to colored people. There are many white people who feel called upon to open orphan asylums. A woman wants a job. They mean well, but they have no executive ability, and the people who are running these orphan asylums, good people, in almost every section of the country, do not come to these conferences. How are we going to reach the people who are running orphan asylums, where the children are put in as orphans and kept until they are 13 or 14 years of age? We are not reaching those people, and I wish we might do so in some way. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF REV. C. C. STAHMANN, OF ST. LOUIS, MO., STATE SUPER-INTENDENT MISSOURI CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

MR. STAHMANN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the question has been asked by a gentleman here as to the percentage of replacements. I am speaking for the society in Missouri. We have about 25 per cent of our children for replacement. There was a time in the history of our society when our directors looked with disfavor upon the report as to replacements, and I remember that one time our president said to me, "Well, haven't you done your work right; what is the matter?" He finally came to the proper view point, and realized that after all the work of replacing is one of the important features; and so we find that as the society grows, as it becomes better known, as we get a better class of applications, we have far less of that.

I find, for my part, that the institution is a proposition not to be despised. There was a time in the history of children's home societies when the idea was to decry it, and when it was said we were simply in the home-finding business. But we have outgrown that, and most of the societies that I know of now have splendid institutions.

There are some children that need the training for a considerable length of time before we can send them out, before we can send them creditably into any home. For a well-disposed child, of course you need no institution. That child will generally land on its feet when it gets into a good home. It will appreciate its home. But it is the wayward child, the child that has passed through a calamity, the child that has been abused, the child that has been placed on its own resources, that must learn that there is a higher order that they must respect.

For that reason I am like St. Paul, in a strait betwixt two things: First of all, the home. Secondly, institutional training is not to be despised.

REMARKS OF MR. SUMNER W. HAYNES, OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND., SUPER-INTENDENT INDIANA CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

MR. HAYNES. Mr. Chairman, I came here to this conference as a learner; I have nothing to impart. But I find in looking over this programme that it has been the purpose of this committee to subdivide our discussions into a great many topics, and I find that in all of these discussions there is a disposition to spread all over the programme on every topic.

Now, I thought for a time that I was going to get a good point out of this discussion as to whether a normal child shall be placed in a home. You have been talking about the vicious child, the abnormal child, the child of the drunkard, the child of the criminal; you have described just that class of children that have come under my observation in the few months I have been in the business.

I actually believe there is but one answer—and I have not learned it from these discussions—to this question: The normal child should be placed in a home, a family home.

I have a little boy in the institution that I represent who has been there seven years. He has told me twenty times, "Mr. Haynes, I have been in here seven years; I came when I was four." They tell

me at the institution that there never was a better boy there; but he is freckled, he has hair that is red and blue and green sometimes, and stiff as a porcupine. In fact, he is an unattractive child, but somewhere there is a home for that child. [Applause.] I told him when I first came, "George, you are going to have a home," and the only reason he has not gotten a home is because I have not found one good enough for him.

I say, gentlemen, let us wait until the topic comes up before we discuss it. You have at No. 10 on the programme these topics which you are attempting to discuss here, which you can discuss when you get to them. Then use your breath and your sense. Give us fellows who do not know anything about this from experience the benefit of what you really know, and you can do that by sticking to the text.

I believe in the institution, but not for the normal child. [Applause.]

**ADDRESS OF MR. EDWIN D. SOLENBERGER, OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
GENERAL SECRETARY PENNSYLVANIA CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.**

MR. SOLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, while proposition 12 brings up the question of the investigation of applicants for children, the inspection of homes before placing children in them, and the visitation of children after placement, I believe it is logical to consider, in discussing the subject of placing out normal dependent children, just what is meant by the clause "wherever practicable." For example we must consider the question of our ability to find a sufficient number of homes suited to the racial and religious affiliations of the children to be placed out. The society which I represent has at the present time about 1,500 children under supervision. Of these about 100 are colored children living for the most part with foster parents of their own race. The society has also under supervision a number of Jewish children placed with Jewish families under special arrangement with the Jewish charities. Again, we have several hundred Catholic boys and girls placed with Catholic families, approved by the priests of their respective parishes, while the children of Protestant parents are living with families representing various non-Catholic denominations. Not every American community affords equal facilities for finding good homes of the various races and religions, and it may be necessary for us to undertake to develop opportunities for placing certain kinds of children.

It seems to me that we have reached a point in the discussion of this subject where we must take into account the standard of placing out, the kind and quality of private families ready to receive normal, dependent children, the regard which must be paid to racial and religious differences of the children concerned, and the whole question of after supervision with all it involves. To make it "practicable" to carry out the affirmative of the proposition under discussion it will be necessary to have an efficient placing-out agency with an up-to-date record system and an adequate force of trained agents to carefully select the foster homes, to fit the child and home together with discrimination, and to supervise the child properly after placement.

I believe the next forward step in the placing of children in family homes will be a more careful examination of the kind and quality of family homes in which we place the children. Mr. R. R. Reeder, of New York, in his series of articles in *Charities and the Commons*,

pointed out in substance that placing-out societies put the emphasis at the wrong place in printing pictures of houses in the country where they have placed children and in telling about the trees and grass, the ponies and carts, the cows and chickens, etc. He said it is the personality of the family in which the child is placed that counts; that unless the foster parents are sympathetic, lovable characters who have influence with the child, he will not necessarily be helped by his physical environment.

We must recognize that it means something to become responsible for the selection of a foster home for a dependent child. Upon our decision depends to a large extent the physical, mental, and moral training of the child, and the kind of home selected determines in a large measure the influences which will surround the child and the general environment under which he will grow up.

Too much emphasis can not be placed upon the importance of adequate records for placing-out agencies. When a child is placed with Mr. and Mrs. Blank there should be on file in the office of the society making the placement a written record containing the information upon which is founded the belief that the home of Mr. and Mrs. Blank is a good one for the child. [Applause.] I know of a certain placing-out agency incorporated and chartered by a State many miles from here which has at this present moment at least 100 children living in homes concerning which there is no written information on file in the office of the society which made the placement. I know of another placing-out agency much nearer to us which until quite recently could not account for a considerable number of its young wards, while many of the homes in which children were placed had not been inspected and subjected to careful investigation.

It is important also that the placing-out agency be sufficiently well founded financially to be able to guarantee that the children received from year to year can and will be supervised and safeguarded until they have attained their majority or passed from care of the society by return to parents or relatives or by legal adoption. A placing-out agency can not go into liquidation at the end of three, five, or ten years and discontinue its work without inflicting untold injury upon its wards.

In emphasizing these points in connection with the "practicability" of placing out dependent children, I wish to be understood as favoring the affirmative of the proposition, for I believe that most of the placing-out agencies throughout the country are recognizing as never before their responsibility and their great opportunity. But in order to make progress we must recognize that these practical considerations are most important and before taking, too decidedly, either the affirmative or the negative as to placing normal, dependent children in family homes, we must not overlook the full meaning of the clause "wherever practicable," and under that clause, Mr. Chairman, I enter these remarks.

REMARKS OF MR. CHARLES W. BIRTWELL, OF BOSTON, MASS., GENERAL SECRETARY BOSTON CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.

MR. BIRTWELL. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, with Mr. Haynes's remarks still clear in my mind, I dare to rise.

The President said that the goal for each child was family life.

I want to say that for a considerable time now there have been four actual, concrete, practical charitable agencies in Boston that handle the normal child in this way: From the moment the child crosses the threshold of any one of these societies, that is, from the moment it is decided to care for the child, all thought of institutional care, all thought of those things which an abnormal child might demand, is eliminated, and the plan is instantly, right at the threshold, to take that child by the hand, and from that minute, without delay, arrive at the goal by placing the child directly in a family. Of course we pay board. So we avoid these circuitous routes, these tedious, unhappy detours, supposed to be necessary by our institution friends.

My good friend here speaks of what psychology teaches. Well, I know what my study and experience of life tell me is good, what I should want for my little boy if my wife and I were blotted from his life. If he should fall into the hands of charity I should pray God to guide him to an agency that, shunning all strange devices, would open for him at once the door to family life.

Orphan or not, and whether or not the selection of an adoptive home may require time, and equally if the period of needed care be long or short, it is all the same. Is it morning? Is it night? Has the office been open late, and is it 7 or 8 o'clock? No matter, my child, you shall this very hour go with me to a good family; a good woman and her husband, their daughter and their son, shall welcome you, or I will know why not. [Applause.]

The goal is at the start, with no interval, none whatever, and to the man who tells me that in his state there are not families enough, I say, "Have you made a real effort to find them?" The people who flatter us that only in Massachusetts are there good families enough, insult their own communities and declare their own inefficiency. [Applause.]

I decline to believe that a group of resolute men and women, working directly to make the threshold the goal, will fail to find in any community in America the families, the good men and women, with whom they can place these children—for adoption, if they are orphans; to board a day or a week or a month, while the mother undergoes the operation at the hospital; to stay a year, five years, ten years, if it shall be that length of time before the blessed reunion can take place when the children can join the widowed mother or the father. Family life every time and immediately, unless you have proved by trial that it is impossible. [Applause.]

**REMARKS OF MR. JAMES E. WEST, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., SECRETARY
NATIONAL CHILD-RESCUE LEAGUE.**

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I must confess that I feel very much like our friend Mr. Haynes from Indiana. I have been greatly disappointed at the discussions this morning. We seem to forget the conditions which confront us. Probably because every one here is willing to agree to this proposition, it has been seen fit by some speakers to dwell upon the stumbling blocks in the road of doing what we want this conference to indorse.

I am afraid that if a stranger to this subject could have heard some of the discussions this morning he would think that we had some doubt as to whether or not children normal in mind and body, and not requiring special training, who must be removed from their own homes, should be cared for in families, wherever practicable.

Now, I am sure it is not the wish of this conference to have such an impression go forth. I believe that nine out of ten—yea, more—of the people present would agree to the proposition, "whenever practicable, place the child in the family home"; and I plead with you all to bear in mind that it is incumbent upon those of us who do agree to this proposition to spread that gospel, to let the world know that that is what we believe in, because it will do wonders for the children who are not now in homes.

The great difficulty about this proposition as it impressed itself on me, as I have made a study of the subject and have been working in it so actively, is that there is a failure on the part of some very well-meaning people to realize fully the modern thought on this subject.

In connection with the work with which I have been closely identified during the last year, it has been surprisingly demonstrated that it is practicable to do far more than is being done. I grant that probably everything that has been said in the way of difficulty is true, yet the fact remains that there are thousands of homes to-day which are available for children. In regard to the children that I have had the privilege in assisting to place in the last year—and I am happy to say that we have had the privilege of placing about 500 in good homes—there have been many times more applicants than we have been able to supply. Specifically, we have offered some 65 children for adoption, and we have had something like 5,000 people applying for those children—many of them sentimentalists, many of them offering homes that were worthless, but many of them offering very fine homes. [Applause.]

The fact which has impressed itself upon me, and which impressed itself upon the President of the United States, and which should impress itself upon you, is that the agents who are in the field with equipment to do efficient work are unable to get children to place in family homes, although they have after careful investigation found them most desirable. With that condition existing, let us put emphasis upon proposition No. 5 in the affirmative, and let the condition be reversed; let there be more children seeking homes than there are homes available. Those who would have it otherwise, I say, with all the earnestness and strength that I possess, are assuming a grave responsibility for the child that is denied the benefit and the joy of the family home.

So I plead with you, ladies and gentlemen, not to take this proposition as too fundamental to be seriously discussed. It is a thing which we must impress upon the community so that those of us who agree to it will have increased facilities for doing placing-out work. We do not want to destroy the institution, we do not want to have our consideration of this topic interpreted as an attack upon the institution; but we would like to have it interpreted as a plea for increased facilities for doing placing-out work.

Needless to say, all of us who talk along this line take it for granted that this placing-out work must be done efficiently; it must be done by people trained to do that work; it must be done at great expense; it must be done in a way in which the child's interest will be protected against all possible criticism, and against all chance of more harm being done to the child in the home than in the institution.

So I would leave with you this message: That there are to-day thousands of homes available for children, and that there are to-day

in institutions, for reasons that need not be discussed—in one place, it is one thing, and in some other place it is another, but, generally speaking, it is because of the lack of understanding on this subject—children who could be placed in these homes. Let us exert our influence to get more of these children out of the institution and into the family home, and give them their birthright. [Applause.]

(At this point Doctor Devine took the chair.)

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. The temporary chair is instructed by the permanent chair to recognize Mr. Carroll, of South Carolina.

**ADDRESS OF MR. RICHARD CARROLL, OF COLUMBIA, S. C., MANAGER
SOUTH CAROLINA INDUSTRIAL HOME FOR DESTITUTE AND DEPEND-
ENT COLORED CHILDREN.**

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, it takes a smart man to make a short speech. I have been here two days, and I have been thinking of the fact of the colored man being a problem.

My dear friends, my speech is just eight minutes long, and I wish I had time to read it all. I wrote it before I came here; if I had to write it over again, I should say something else.

I have been placing children for eleven years, and in that time I have placed 543. We have 20 now. Most of these are little children from 3 years to 11 years of age. As soon as I find a good home with a white or a colored family in South Carolina I place the child. I get about \$975 a year with which to support this institution. I raise most of the money by lecturing and preaching, and I give all I get, above my living, to the work. [Applause.] Last year I sold wood to pay the principal. We have three teachers. Sometimes I sell cows which we have on hand, or clothing, or anything, to keep the work going.

I want to read this paper, if you will let me. I hope you will, as I will not trouble you any more.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. If you will pardon the chairman, the chair will have to ask for a ruling of the conference if you wish to discuss another subject than that announced on the programme. We are now discussing topic No. 5, "Should children normal in mind and body, and not requiring special training, who must be removed from their own homes, be cared for in families, wherever practicable," and the bearing of your remarks to that topic has not been apparent.

Mr. CARROLL. That is just what I am discussing.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Get to the subject as quickly as you can, Mr. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL (reading):

I was appointed chaplain of the Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry in the spring of 1898 by the late President of the United States, William McKinley, during the Spanish-American war. I spent much of my time studying human nature as it presented itself to me in the daily life of the soldiers, white and black. It was while in this service I learned the inestimable value of home training and the value of a well-regulated Christian home under the influence and guidance of a mother and father. It was there that I learned that the greatest institution on earth for the proper training of the youth is the home.

The home regulates society, the church, the Government, and the world. It is the regulator for all institutions, none of which rises higher than the home, none is purer than the fountain, this source of all good or evil, the real school of the Christian, the statesman, the teacher, the prophet, and the king or ruler. The church, though of divine origin, is not as old as the home; in fact, the home is the mother of the church. It was born in the home; the first religious services known to man were held in the

home; the first Sunday school or bible school was organized in the home. The child will never depart from the training that it received in the home circle.

Now, since "the child is father to the man," is it not important that we seek to save the children by finding good homes for the homeless and dependent children where they can be trained religiously, morally, and industrially, so that they will become useful and industrious and law-abiding citizens? We save and elevate the country, the city, the State, and the Union when we save and elevate the children.

It is much cheaper and safer for the State to save them in their youth than to punish them for crime when they become men and women. It is more economical to the taxpayers. Such a work on the part of the State and its citizens will be a safeguard against the majority of those criminals, white and black, who come from that element of our citizenship who were homeless in their youth, and that class that comes from the poorly regulated and inefficient home.

Therefore we see the immense value of orphanages or homes for destitute and dependent children. These institutions are absolutely necessary, especially among the colored people in the South. These institutions should, in every respect, represent well-regulated homes. The inmates should have: First, religious training (nonsectarian); second, they should be taught cleanliness; third, they should be taught to work or given some kind of a trade; fourth, they should be given a common school education.

These institutions should be established in the country, where there is plenty of fresh air and sunshine. Every one of the children should be taught agriculture and horticulture, regardless of what other trades they may take later in life. Real home training should be emphasized, and these institutions, as far as possible, should be conducted on the cottage plan, not to exceed 15 or 20 children. Everything should be done that may be possible to make the training within these cottages represent the well-regulated home, and the child should not be allowed to leave the institution until he or she is old enough, and have sufficient education and training, to enable them to take care of themselves wherever they may go. The heads of these institutions should seek homes and employment for the inmates of the institutions, and not send them out to drift.

There should be an industrial home for destitute and dependent children in every State for orphans, half orphans, and children who have parents that are not able to give them the right kind of religious, moral, intellectual, and industrial training in their own homes. Such an institution should have the moral and financial support of the citizens and the Commonwealth. This would be in truth "Casting bread upon the waters." This would be investing money in human lives, and the good results would be seen in the improvement of our citizens. There is no work on earth greater than that which saves the lives of men and women, making these lives useful to the individual who has been saved and to the community in which he or she lives.

Every State should have its reformatory or house of correction for juvenile criminals. Such institutions should be so conducted that the boy or girl who is sent there by the courts will come away improved in morals and intelligence, with a trained hand backed up by an intelligent brain. In these institutions nothing should be done to harden the hearts of the inmates or make them feel that they are criminals, and thus hopeless. There is more for the State and the taxpayers in saving life than in destroying it. It is better to elevate human life than to crush it. It is far better to turn a man out of prison reformed and refined than to turn him out a worse criminal. All prisoners should be made "prisoners of hope."

Thus you see, if well-regulated industrial homes for destitute and dependent children are in every State in the Union, and endowed with sufficient funds to support them and have them conducted on the cottage plan, surrounded by a farm, with sufficient buildings and equipments for other industries and trades, and the Commonwealth supporting and maintaining a house of correction or a reformatory for juvenile criminals, conducted on a similar plan, and an industrial home for destitute children, the dependent-child problem would be solved.

As to placing children in homes, as a colored man I find a few problems. In the first place, the most of the homes of the colored people in the South are amply supplied; there are very few families who have not as many children as they can take care of. I know some that have from 11 to 16 more than they can feed, clothe, educate, and care for properly, and they are always willing and ready to give away those that they can not control. But all poor people seem to be blessed with large families.

Here is another problem: Few families desire to take a child unless that child is old enough and intelligent enough to render service. Again, there would be much trouble in ascertaining the worthiness and the responsibility of the families who might apply for these children. The question is, would the child's condition, morally and religiously, be bettered or made worse by placing them in some homes? Good

homes are not as numerous as houses and dwellings. The question is, "Who lives here?" There are some exceptions, and small children can be placed in some homes; but the best solution of the dependent-child problem is the founding of orphanages and industrial homes, and taking children into them from 1 month old, if destitute, up to 13 years of age, and keeping them there until they are prepared for life's battles, or until good homes are found for them.

Mr. LOOMIS. Mr. Chairman—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Mr. Loomis, of New Jersey.

Mr. LOOMIS. I call your attention to the fact that the time has about come when we should pass to the next topic. Have you any desire to continue the discussion of this topic beyond the speaker who has now been recognized, or shall it be understood that we close with his remarks and pass to the next topic?

REMARKS OF MR. FRANK D. LOOMIS, OF NEWARK, N. J., GENERAL SECRETARY OF CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS VERSUS HOME-FINDING SOCIETIES.

Mr. LOOMIS. Institutionalism is said to have three distinct arguments in its favor. First and foremost among these, in the popular mind, at least, is the argument that an institution is a religious organization. Here the child of sinful parents is snatched from catastrophe. Here he is protected from vice during the tender years of his childhood. Here he is surrounded by the best of religious influences. Here he may remain until he has become firmly established in the straight and narrow way.

These suppositions are strengthened by a visit to the institution. One hears the children repeat long chapters of scripture; one sees them at their prayers; one observes the reverence of their conduct. A young boy is pointed out. He is the son of a drunkard who has gone to the bad. This boy was recently converted and he has joined the church. What a marvelous transformation. Here are results, attained in a moment, by a leap, in the twinkling of an eye. How many years of sermons might be preached to accomplish as much.

Just so. Let us look further into this argument.

That which is put on is not religion. Religion is a life, not a cloak. A child may imitate the ways of virtue without in the least appreciating them. Character springs from within, and it grows to strength and beauty only after years of patient toil. It develops strength by overcoming resistance. It develops beauty out of the personal love and beauty which surround it. The affection of a sainted mother, the love of a father, the friendship of a friend who really cared—therein lies the secret of the hero. The only religious training of any consequence is personal.

Does the child in an institution enjoy this personal love? Certainly, as a rule, not from the managers. The managers seldom make any pretense of knowing the children personally. You may question leading managers about children who have been in their institution for months or years and find that they have never heard of them. They do not take these children to their homes. They do not walk with them and talk with them. They do not sit with them in church.

Perhaps it is not a duty of managers to know the children personally. They are directors, the managers, of the institutions—not the workers. The care takers know the children. Very well, then.

Care takers are persons employed to care for the children; they are paid for it. Remember that, please, when you come to talk about the care of children in boarding homes. The woman paid to care for children in her own home is also a care taker, the chief difference in the situation of the two being that one is employed to care for children in a normal way, while living in a perfectly normal way herself, while the other is employed to live in an abnormal way while she cares for children also living abnormally. Both receive money for their services. The work of the world is done by people who are paid for it—or underpaid.

Do institutional care takers deal personally with their children? Some of them attempt it, and that is why the best of them are saying, "Give us fewer children. Give us 10 instead of 50. Let us live with these 10 in as normal a fashion as possible. How can we give ourselves personally to 50?" They can't, and they don't. No one can. What! Shut a woman in a room with 50 noisy children and expect her to know and love each one as a mother knows and loves her little flock! In the close atmosphere of an institution! Confined there day and night! Good heavens! "Even the most generous friend of institutionalism does not expect that, and the most critical can not demand it." We could forgive the overworked care taker if occasionally she were cross and nervous.

If the children in institutions do not receive this personal love and affection, what then? They are being reared without it. They are being deprived of it. There it is, dormant, almost within their reach, within view of their institution windows, but still withheld. What a tragedy—to be living one's life in the world alone! Let society look well to this. The wrong done to a child does not end with itself.

An institution is not a religious organization. Religion injected into children by wholesale methods is not skin-deep. Hundreds of children dismiss it immediately upon their attainment to freedom. Such applied religion has often resulted afterwards in making the very appearance of religion obnoxious. In presenting the religious argument, the friends of institutions are merely laying emphasis upon their weakest point.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sherrard, Doctor McKenna, and others desire to speak. What is the pleasure of the conference? Unless there is a motion the chair will call for the next topic. If you wish to continue this subject the chair will entertain a motion to that effect.

MR. ROBINSON. I move that the present subject be continued.

The motion was seconded.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN. It has been moved and seconded that the discussion of this subject be continued. You understand, of course, that cuts down the time given to other topics. Is it the idea of the mover to continue with three three-minute addresses?

MR. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

MR. HUNT. Could we amend that, Mr. Chairman, so as to limit the time to nine minutes or ten minutes?

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN. Yes.

MR. HUNT. I make that motion.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN. To save time, the chair will incorporate the suggestion in the motion. The motion is that the discussion of

this topic be continued for ten minutes under the three-minute rule. That will allow for three speeches.

The motion was put to the conference, and was not agreed to.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. The secretary will read proposition No. 6.

Mr. SHERRARD. I rise to make an inquiry in regard to the time at which the resolutions will be presented.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. At 4 o'clock this afternoon, I understand.

Mr. SHERRARD. That is when the committee will report, but I have one or two resolutions which I would like to present and have action taken on them some time.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. I would suggest that they be deferred until the close of the morning session.

The SECRETARY. No. 6 is the next topic for discussion. (Reading:)

So far as institutions may be necessary, should they be conducted on the cottage plan; and should the cottage unit exceed 25 children.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. This topic will be opened by Doctor Reeder, of New York.

**ADDRESS OF DR. RUDOLPH R. REEDER, OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON,
N. Y., SUPERINTENDENT NEW YORK ORPHANAGE, ETC.**

Doctor REEDER. The question as to whether the congregate or the cottage type of institution should be provided for the dependent child is so manifestly one-sided to those who have tried both that no discussion is necessary. But there are many people interested in the question who have tried neither one, and to them the question may be an open one. For the sake of clearness to all, the proposition before us needs definition and statement, if not argument. There are four concepts to be kept clearly in mind throughout the discussion. These are the natural home of the child, the home into which he was born, his birthright, the congregate institution, the cottage institution, and the family home. The first of these concepts is expressed by the simple term "home," without trimmings or prefixes, such as a capital "H," foster, adopted, boarding, or institutional. It takes its place by the side of mother, and is that of which poets sing, statesmen dream, and travelers write. We can not describe it—it is beyond description—but deep down in our race instincts we feel and know what it is.

Now, this concept we will designate as the real thing. Every other concept or abiding place which may be proposed as a substitute for this natural heritage of the child, whether it be congregate institution, cottage institution, boarding home, indenture home, or adopted home, is not the real thing. The yearning for blood kindred is a deep seated, natural instinct in every child. It is a soul hunger which no foster home, whatever its type, can permanently satisfy. Think of an effort to fit your own child at even 6 years of age into somebody else's home, and no further discussion of this point will be necessary. Even where great affection enters into the foster relationship, as it sometimes does, and ignorance of the facts of birth and adoption on the part of the child while young makes it possible to strengthen the ties between parents and child, yet with what a shock does the truth break upon the child when he learns his true relation to the foster home and parents, and that he is not to those whom he called by endearing terms of blood kinship "bone of their

bone and flesh of their flesh." His instinctive hunger "asked for bread and ye gave it a stone."

The instant an adopted child learns that the relation which he thought he sustained to his foster parents is false, an inexpressible feeling of sadness and loneliness takes possession of him. There is probably not one in this audience who has not known of such cases.

This is not intended as an argument against the method of caring for the dependent child by adoption or placing in family homes, but only to call attention to the fact that there is but one home for every child, and that the one into which he was born, and all others, from the poorest to the best, from the stupefying monotony of the congregate institution to the free and happy life in the well-to-do private family, are but substitutes.

As already intimated, the poorest type of substitute home is the congregate institution. It ought to be born again or go out of business. The life of the child in most of these institutions is so dreary, soul shriveling, and void of happy interests, the daily routine of marching and eating and singing and of lining up for whatever is to be done so stupefying, as to inhibit the child's normal development.

The cottage type of institutional home offers such a wealth of interests, industries, privileges, and opportunities compared to the congregate home that absolutely nothing is left to be said in favor of the latter except that it is cheaper, and even this, like the same argument presented by the advocates of child labor, is not true in the long run. No system which fails to develop the latent powers of the child to their full capacity can be regarded in the long run as economical.

But the cottage plan which we propose as incomparably better than the congregate home needs definition. The cottage plan does not mean merely a method of housing. In the hands of institutionalized managers it is capable of being made almost as institutional as the congregate form of housing. Institutionalism is a state of mind rather than a mode of dwelling. The social, industrial, economic, ethical, and spiritual elements which enter into the cottage plan are of greater moment than its material and spatial features. But even on the material side it does not mean merely separate houses to sleep in and sit in or play in, while all go to a central dining room for meals which have been prepared in the large institution kitchen. The cottage should be as complete an imitation of the natural home of the child as it is possible to make it. None of the features of a model home must be overlooked. Sitting room and library, dining room, kitchen and pantry, bed rooms, toilets, attic, cellar, and porches, all should be there, for each one functions and has important interests and associations in the life of the child. Outside the cottage, flower beds, ornamental trees and shrubs, vegetable gardens, orchard and play space are important accessories.

The number of children in each family group is determined by four factors. First, the ability and personality of the cottage matron; second, the relation of the children to one another, whether the group is made up of single members of separate families or of several sets of brothers or sisters representing a few families; third, the number necessary to develop in the group a helpful cottage spirit or *esprit du corps*; fourth, the amount of work required of the cottage mother in the matter of supplying provisions, clothing, care in sickness,

supervision of laundry, etc. If responsibility for these things is shared largely by other helpers, leaving the mother more time for personal association and oversight of the children, the group may be larger. As a rule, I should say the number in the group should not exceed 25 and less than 15 is not necessarily an advantage.

The cottage plan is so new in this country that but few of its possibilities have been realized. As conceived of by the writer it is not the modern deteriorated type of home, but rather an all-round, old-fashioned home with school attached; not the empty, uninteresting home so common to-day, which is much like a boarding house, but a home of a hundred years ago, in which obedience, industrial training, and daily mutual services among the members of the household were important features.

The institution cottage home adequately equipped and under able management will successfully compete with any other plan yet proposed for the care and education of the dependent child. It has certain advantages over the private family home. In the private home authority, if it exists at all, is in the hands of the parents who administer it without supervision. Its absence on the one hand and abuse on the other are apparent from the increase of juvenile crime and delinquency and the records of the society for the prevention of cruelty to children. In the institution cottage the matron who is in loco parentis is under the supervision of one higher up, who himself is under the board of trustees or managers, still higher up. The same chain of supervision applies to the children's dietary, clothing, industrial, academic, and religious training. The system is analogous to that of bringing the old time, isolated, rural school of fifty years ago with its low standards of scholarship, its poorly qualified teachers and its want of ideals and inspiration, under the expert oversight of well trained and scholarly supervisors, as has been done in Massachusetts and is being done in other States.

The cottage plan efficiently administered appeals to the initiative in every child. It is strong in the four particular features in which the average American home of to-day is weak, namely, obedience, home-making industries, mutual services among the members of the household, and a correlation of home life and school curriculum. There is no dead levelism in such a home and school.

In the institution with which I am most familiar the children are not only under the direct daily oversight of the foster mother at home and the regular teachers who instruct them in the school, just as the child is in the ordinary home, but an expert dietitian supervises menus, a cooking teacher gives weekly lessons in cooking and serving the meals, a trained seamstress teaches the little girls to sew and mend, and a skillful dressmaker instructs the older girls how to repair and to cut, fit, and make their own clothes; a trained laundress teaches them how to wash and iron, a manual training instructor teaches the boys how to make and repair things, a gardener teaches both boys and girls how to raise vegetables and flowers, a poultryman shows them how to raise and handle poultry, and over all is a general superintendent to correlate, round up, and interpret in terms of education, of character, and of life experience all these various interests and forms of training. These many-sided home interests and industries, personal contact with well-trained teachers and the pressure of educational incentives which each adult brings to bear upon the child,

will surely discover and develop the latent powers and promise of each young life. This is perhaps as much as any foster home can accomplish.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN. The discussion will be continued by Mr. Merrill, of Minnesota.

ADDRESS OF MR. GALEN A. MERRILL, OF OWATONNA, MINN., SUPERINTENDENT MINNESOTA STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOR DEPENDENT AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN.

MR. MERRILL. Institutions for children are looked upon as tending necessarily to mechanical and impersonal work, and we are asked whether the operation of their machinery really improves the condition of the children committed to them and constitutes training that is personal and helpful, or whether it is so institutional and mechanical as to lose the individual.

There is danger, especially in the large institution conducted on the congregate plan, that instead of holding the resources of the institution subservient to the individual worker and child the reverse will be true, and that the individual worker who should devote his time to helping and training the child—the vital work of the institution—will be prevented from doing so by the exactions of institutional routine.

The child in the institution is drawn up in line and lectured on truthfulness and morality. He plays with a button or a string and does not hear it. The only effective training the institution child gets is when somebody, for the time being a father or a mother to him, gets hold of him as an individual and shows him these things. Then he is interested and effective training is possible.

If the question were asked, Which is better for the training of a child, a good institution or a good home? There could be but one answer. The home, the family home.

If the question were varied to compare a poor institution with a good home, the same answer would be still more emphatic. But if we are asked to consider a good institution as opposed to a poor home then our answer becomes a more difficult matter. The family is so simple and family relations are so admirable, so splendid, when they exist naturally, but so likely to be imperfect and a failure when we try to establish them artificially.

Institution life which deals with children collectively and not individually is opposed to the natural instincts of a child, because a child needs to be individualized, particularly the young child. To keep him in a crowd, to educate him "in the lump," is to fly in the face of all the natural ways of growth. It is an objection to our public schools that every teacher must have so many pupils that she can not individualize her children. The child must necessarily be too much repressed. He must "keep still," that absolutely impossible thing that we are always asking of children. However, school hours are short, and the child in the family has the freedom of home wherein to ask his questions and present his childish arguments and get his crude ideas corrected.

But it is unfortunate for him if he must go from the restraint of school into a home life equally restrained, where he must sit up in good order, and march in a nice line, and mustn't ask questions, or, if he does, they are lost in the din of forty other questions asked by

forty other little mortals just as eager as he, and none of them get answered, because the distracted house mother is physically unable to divide herself among forty at once, no matter how strong she may be, or how motherly her soul, or how capable of answering questions her intellect may be.

The little baby especially must have his mother all to himself—there is usually but one at a time in a family, and it is meant to be so. Physically nature protests against wholesale mothering of babies in any way. They die, or live only a stunted existence, if they can not be physically mothered one by one. And it is just as true of the mental and moral faculties as of the physical.

Later there comes a time when the boy or girl must have the companionship of other boys and girls, the age when clubs and associations and crowds have their charm, when military drill and concert movements are delightful. Now, the training "in the lump" may produce straight shoulders and manly bearing, and so be productive of good externally, but it must be supplemented by just as much individualizing mentally and spiritually, or a different kind of harm results. In fact, the relations of children with each other should be under normal conditions as far as possible.

Institutions make for repression and repression hinders growth. The home which has the advantages of the public schools and the church is better for the normal child. But the children that need homes are numbered by thousands—many of whom must have temporary protection from want and suffering until homes can be found for them, and others the correction of physical defects or habits that at first unfit them to go into families—so institutions are necessary.

The institution that comes nearest to the home, that can individualize its children, is the one that is successful. This means the careful classification and division of the children into family groups—small groups, families, in which some one with tender sympathies and a responsive heart can establish personal relations that are genuine and helpful with each member.

The asylum, the single vast building, is not appropriate for the purpose. There is but one kind of institution which meets the needs of the case. The tendency in an institution is to aggregate, and the institution that offers the least excuse for this and the best facilities to segregate, is the one that is constructed on the cottage plan. It should consist of a group of small cottages with separate playgrounds, each to accommodate not to exceed 25 children, an administration building, a hospital, schoolhouse, and auditorium, and if located on a farm such farm buildings as may be needed.

The whole should form a community of families who live as nearly as possible like families in ordinary homes.

With a separate school building on the premises, apart from the cottage dwellings, the children can leave their cottage homes when "school calls" at 9 o'clock and go to school after the manner of children in the village or city attending the public schools.

The buildings need not be pretentious, but they should of course be adapted to their purpose, and I would have each cottage occupied by less than 25 children rather than more, if the taxpayers or supporters will permit. But in truth if the family unit does not exceed 25, and there are teachers and matrons enough, wholesome family life can be furnished as far as such life is possible in an institution.

**MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY MR. ADOLPH LEWISOHN, PRESIDENT,
HEBREW SHELTERING GUARDIAN SOCIETY, NEW YORK CITY.**

Probably no question which concerns the American people is of more importance than the one which has been submitted to this conference by the President. The children of to-day will be the citizens of to-morrow. The care and the treatment which we give them will influence their future, and upon this care will depend the fact whether they shall be useful and worthy citizens of our Republic or whether they will eventually help to fill our jails and our almshouses.

Generally speaking, the problem of child dependency groups itself under three distinct headings:

- (a) The orphan and half orphan child.
- (b) The destitute child with both parents living, but who, for certain reasons, are unable to provide for its support.
- (c) The child with improper guardianship.

I think there can be no question to-day that, where there are no legal ties preventing the placing out for adoption of full orphan children, this method is the one which should be pursued. It has been amply demonstrated that it is feasible to find proper private homes, with respectable and conscientious foster parents, who are very willing to assume full legal responsibility for full orphan children, and to bring them up and train them as their own. I believe that experience will bear me out that the method of preliminary placing out of such children, with a view to subsequent adoption, is the most rational method of caring for full orphan children.

So far as the half orphan children are concerned, a somewhat different problem presents itself. The large majority of half orphan children have been robbed of the father through death, and are placed in institutions for the care of children, or become dependents, owing to the inability of their mothers to provide for their maintenance. I think it can be safely stated that, in the large majority of these cases, the predominating fact which brings these children to the notice of public or private authorities is the mere inability of the mother to maintain her offspring. Comparatively few of these children require supervision and care on the part of outsiders by reason of the physical or moral inability of the surviving parent. The experience of the philanthropic societies throughout the United States is convincing that, if the mothers were given ample subsidy, there would be no necessity whatever for placing these children either in institutions or in foster homes. Whether such subsidy should be given from private or public funds is at the present moment not of interest. The fact remains that we have at hand an exceptionally simple solution of the children problem, by caring for children, not in institutions, not in foster homes, but with their own mothers, who can give them the parental love and the parental attention, whose value is incalculable, and which can not be obtained for them in any other way.

I may mention here, incidentally, the limited number of children—half orphans—who become dependent, not through the death of the father, but through the death of the mother, and the inability of the father to make proper provision for his children. Frequently this is not so much a financial question as the sheer inability on the part of the father to give his children the home attention which they

require. For such children as these, temporary boarding homes would be highly acceptable, particularly if the father could board with them. This would give him the opportunity of supervising their education and general training, leaving to the family with whom they reside the supervision of physical maintenance.

When we come to consider the question of destitute children, the situation becomes even more complicated. Many of such children are committed to institutions to-day by reason of the illness of their parents. Such illness may be temporary or permanent. In the former it is necessary that temporary provision for the care of the children should be made. So far as I am able to judge this can be done better to-day through the medium of an institution than in any other form, and I feel that, for this reason, there will still be necessity for institutions of some form or other for the care of a considerable percentage of dependent children in the United States.

What has been said of dependent children with both parents living applies with equal force to children who become dependents, or who are committed or placed in institutions by reason of improper guardianship. There are many valid reasons why such children should not be placed in private homes. There is always a possibility that the offending parent or parents may reform, and, when the latter occurs, the opportunity should be given to them to resume their parental duties. I can not discuss this subject at length at this time, but I am of the belief that for such children as these, where there is a likelihood that the separation from the parent may be of short duration, the institution is preferable to the private home for the care of such children.

Finally, it should be remembered that there is a percentage of abnormal or atypical children, who require special care and special attention not always obtainable in the private home. There are to-day specially equipped institutions for the care of such children of well-to-do parents, who realize that the child is better off under the care of competent instructors than in its own home. For such children, if they are dependent, an institution will be required, and the mere fact of their dependency should not bar them from receiving as careful instruction, as thorough training, to fit them for their future as is the case with those better endowed with worldly goods.

To summarize, I would say that the problem of the care of dependent children must, in view of the above classes of dependents, be likewise subdivided into three divisions:

1. Boarding out or placing out of children in private homes.
2. Subsidizing the surviving parent, particularly the mother, to enable her to keep her children at home with her and to preserve the integrity of the family.
3. Children's institutions for those who can not be properly provided for in either of the above-mentioned manners.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. The chair suggests that twenty minutes is as much as it is possible to allot to further discussion on this subject, unless the conference prefers to rule otherwise. The chair prefers to recognize some one who will take the negative of this proposition, some one who is opposed to the cottage plan. Then, after allotting five minutes to such a speech in opposition, to allow three minutes for general discussion.

Doctor Bernstein is recognized. The chair will remind the conference that the question is upon the adoption of the cottage plan in the case of children who are in institutions. Do you wish to speak in opposition?

REMARKS OF DR. LUDWIG B. BERNSTEIN, OF NEW YORK CITY, SUPERINTENDENT HEBREW SHELTERING GUARDIAN ORPHAN ASYLUM.

Doctor BERNSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rectify the impression of the chair. I am not willing to oppose the cottage plan. On the contrary, I think that every one of the child-caring institutions that are being conducted on the congregate plan will recognize that there are superior facilities for the care of the individual child under the cottage plan as compared to the congregate plan. But, unfortunately, it is for most of the institutions an academic question.

After all, in order to build a cottage home for one thousand children, it is necessary to have the ready cash, and if this convention would allow us to secure it, I am sure that there would be thousands who would be grateful to it. I know an institution in New York which is willing to adopt a cottage plan, but it needs a little money. It needs only a half million dollars more in order to change from the congregate to the cottage plan, and that almost ridiculously little sum of a half million dollars prevents it from doing so.

Under such circumstances, the question that presents itself to the congregate institution is a very concrete and definite one. Is there still a possibility of growth and development or evolution in the work that we are doing in congregate institutions? My answer is, emphatically, yes.

As you all know there are institutions and institutions with an enormous difference in aim, purpose, and method. In England I have seen an institution which for the past seventy-five years has been training its girls for domestic service. On the other hand, I know of an institution which has 15 per cent of its children in the graduating class of the public school, in high school, colleges, and technical institutions; an institution which, although conducted on the congregate plan, makes it still possible for its children to develop their individuality and character through a great variety of social and civic activities.

The institution that is giving the child the possibility of his or her individual development, as far as it is possible; the institution that allows for social activities; the institution that allows for self-government among the children; the institution that demands a higher standard of men and women to supervise its children; the institution that recognizes the human side in the life of the child; the institution that recognizes the higher education of the children and properly equips them for life, as far as trades and industries are concerned—I consider that such an institution is doing as good and as valuable work for children as the institution which is more fortunate in regard to its architectural and building arrangements [Applause.]

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Does any one desire to continue this discussion?

REMARKS OF MR. WILLIAM B. STREETER, OF GREENSBORO, N. C., STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY IN THE CAROLINAS.

Mr. STREETER. There is one question which I wish to inject into this discussion.

While believing thoroughly in the cottage plan, if we are to have the institution developed on the cottage plan and caring for not to exceed twenty-five or thirty children in a cottage, the question arises: Shall these cottages be conducted on the coeducational plan or not?

The State of Indiana has the cottage plan by means of the county children's homes, about forty-eight of them, over which I had the honor to be the supervisor in the beginning of the work by the state board of charities. They are all conducted, with the exception now, I believe, of two, on the coeducational plan.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Mr. Robinson, I think, claims the floor. He is president of the Catholic Protectory of New York.

ADDRESS OF MR. GEORGE B. ROBINSON, OF NEW YORK CITY, PRESIDENT NEW YORK CATHOLIC PROTECTOR, ETC.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, a short time ago I made a motion that the discussion be extended a few minutes, simply because I saw three or four speakers on the floor who desired to say something, and I thought it was at least reasonable that the speaker who would close the discussion should be answered as to one or two remarks that he put into the discussion.

I rise at this moment to say a few words in the affirmative on this proposition. I suppose I represent to the minds of some the limit in regard to congregate institutions.

Mr. Reeder, in his remarks in regard to the elimination of the congregate system, was right and just. This elimination will come in time, but it is a very serious proposition in some portions of the country, to change utterly the nature of the institution in a few weeks or a few months. Some of our zealous people seem to think that no institution is better than a congregate institution.

From twenty-nine years' study of this subject I am convinced, and have been convinced for many years, that the keeping of the children in small colonies is far better and is desirable. [Applause.] I would not fix an arbitrary number to constitute a colony; 25 does not make a family any more than 50. It is a mistake to confine this to a certain number. The number should be small; but 50 may be handled by a superior teacher far better than 25 by an inferior teacher. That is where the congregate system still has a chance for there are minds that are capable of giving individual attention; and where children have the right kind of teachers it is a great mistake to suppose that their detention for a short time in a congregate institution breaks the family tie. The family tie between the poor, miserable mothers, as some of them are, of the children of our institution, is far stronger than exists oftentimes in smaller colonies. It depends on the way the institution is conducted. I have seen several cottage institutions in which there was not the contact with the parents of the children that exists in our institution.

I was recently asked by the superintendent of the Brooklyn Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, "What are the results of

the care of children in your congregate institution compared with those of similar children in cottage institutions?" "Well," I said, "the results ought to be far superior in those children from the cottage institution." "I have my doubts," he answered me. "One of your sister institutions conducted on the perfect cottage plan is not producing any better results with the children than you in your congregate institution."

Now, I have had comparatively little experience in the results, but it may be possible where the detention in an institution is short to accomplish good in a congregate institution, and good has been accomplished; but certainly, with the cottage institution, classifying the children properly, the results should be far superior and I am sure that ultimately we will have no congregate system.

We have an institution of 2,500 children. Just imagine one hundred colonies of twenty-five each under our control. I would like to know where the teachers are to come from. I think it would take fifteen years to get the right superintendents for those cottages.

It must not be an immediate change; it must be gradual, and so it will be successful. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF HON. SIMON WOLF, OF WASHINGTON, FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT OF THE HEBREW ORPHAN'S HOME, ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, no one can question the sanctity and importance of the home; the affection and love which emanates from the mother to the child, and that all things being even, the child that needs care and protection has more natural affinities in the home circle than anywhere else. But unfortunately these conditions do not always exist. Indeed, to a large extent they are foreign in the home of those whom misfortune, death, or poverty has overtaken, and thus the institution comes to the rescue and stands in the relation of parent or parents to the extent of bettering the condition of the unfortunate children. I do not know by actual observation or experience as to the condition of institutions under the direct supervision of States or churches, or sectarian organizations, other than that of the Jewish, with which I have been intimately and closely connected for the last forty years. In all of these Jewish institutions, scattered over various areas of our country, I am fully competent to judge, and notably of two of these institutions—the Cleveland Jewish Orphan Asylum and the Atlanta Hebrew Orphan's Home. Of the first I was a founder, of the second I am the founder and president, since its inception. The first has been regarded ever since its creation as a model institution and has had the rare good fortune to have at its head for superintendent men of the widest range of humanity and wise discretion, the present incumbent being Doctor Wolfenstein, who stands preeminent for all that is best in child caring. In the latter there is a pupil of Doctor Wolfenstein's, Mr. R. A. Sonn, who follows splendidly in the footsteps of his master.

These institutions are not conducted upon a proselyting basis, their sole ambition being to raise children on the lines of home training and to instill into them the highest conception of patriotic ideals. They are not a compact mass who govern by rule or rote, but each child is permitted to have individuality. They are not dressed alike so as not to implant into them the feeling that is engendered in

institutions where all are on and in a uniform basis. They go to the public schools; they have their religious training on the Sabbath, and go to the synagogue or temple to worship in common with their elders, and often lead and control the services held. Each child as it develops a special trait for any of the higher professions has its wish gratified, and thus these institutions, as other Jewish institutions of a like character in this country, have graduated a large number of the leading rabbis, physicians, lawyers, engineers, electricians, teachers of the public schools and normal schools, and indeed along all the lines for which men strive. They are not looked upon as aliens to the home when they leave it, but are permitted to look upon it as a resting place at any time when misfortune overtakes them.

Each and every one of these children has a bank account that is kept sacredly for him, and every year he receives prizes for good conduct; thus when he leaves the institution he has from \$100 to \$500 in bank as a nucleus to start life with. Many of them are married in the homes, coming back for that purpose, and some of the superintendents have even married an orphan girl in the home.

They also form alumni associations. The alumni association at Atlanta has already \$5,000 in bank, and when it reaches the sum of \$10,000 they will put it to the endowment fund of the home.

Their physical life is developed in every direction. They have calisthenics, swimming pools, foot ball and base ball games. In short, they are made to feel that they are not in an institution by sufferance, but that they are in a home by choice, and the spirit of ambition is implanted by coming in close contact with each other, and the most friendly and fraternal spirit prevails.

Thus these institutions of which I speak are models of their kind and are not a reproach, but a stimulus.

You can not argue these conditions away by theory or by eloquence. Facts speak louder than words, and experience is the best teacher, and for that reason if institutions can be conducted on the lines as above indicated, there can be no question that they are a great help-meet to steer clear of the deplorable conditions that cause the making of orphan children. In my judgment it were far wiser to look at the cause and origin of the destitution of the children than as to the caring of them. For the latter, there will always be found plenty of men and women who are ready to aid and assist, and plenty of institutions which are conducted on the highest lines of modern ideals, and the loftiest conception of civilization.

And all this is not done by subvention. Not a dollar is received from the State of Ohio or Georgia. Whatever money is needed to carry on these institutions is given by friends of humanity, interested in the work, and, in my judgment, it is a grand thing, for it keeps alive and in constant effulgence the light of a disinterested humanity.

REMARKS OF MRS. FREDERIC SCHOFF, OF PHILADELPHIA, PA., PRESIDENT NATIONAL CONGRESS OF MOTHERS.

Mrs. SCHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on the question of the cottage plan and to show you that its adoption is possible in a large institution.

We have in Philadelphia a girls' house of refuge. It was conducted on the congregate plan, but when we had a woman come there as superintendent who believed in the cottage plan she made that a

cottage institution within a large institution, that is, she congregated the girls into groups. They have their separate tables in separate rooms, and they live together as families live. That was done without any extra expense. She took off the uniform absolutely and allowed the girls their own taste in dress.

This institution, without any extra expenditure, is like a different place, and it is possible in any large institution without waiting for years to divide the children into groups and in that way to give them the individual life.

The girls go to church outside; but this going to church on the outside is contingent on their good behavior. They go to entertainments and lectures, and they have the rights that they should have.

I could not let this opportunity pass without telling you this, because I think it is important in dealing with questions of institutions that have not the money to build cottages, to show that it is possible to adopt the principle even in a large institution before they get the money. [Applause.]

At this point Judge Mack resumed the chair.

REMARKS OF MR. SOLOMON LOWENSTEIN, OF NEW YORK CITY, SUPERINTENDENT HEBREW ORPHAN ASYLUM.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to speak concerning the question of the advisability or preference of the cottage institution over the congregate plan. I do not believe that there is anyone in this audience who does not think that, if possible, all our congregate institutions should be divided into cottage groups under efficient, practical management.

I merely rise to protest against the idea that has been given circulation here this morning and that seems to be taken for granted as a necessary fact, namely, that life in a congregate institution is necessarily of a gloomy, cheerless character. I happen to live in one in which there are about 1,200 children who are not gloomy or cheerless. I do not happen to be of a gloomy nature myself; I spend a good deal of time with the children, and do not find them unhappy or dull. We try to bring as much joy and happiness into the life of the children as possible. We try to make their training as pleasant and diversified as possible. We try to give the children who are about to leave us individual training, and in many cases, especially of the entirely dependent children, such industrial training as may fit them for their future lives.

As I said above, while believing firmly in the cottage institution, I wish to dissent from the idea that living in a congregate institution is necessarily a hopeless, dreary, cheerless lot. It is nothing of the sort. The children can derive much happiness from such life, and can be prepared to do excellent work after their discharge.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further discussion on this subject, we will proceed to the next. The secretary will read it.

The SECRETARY. (Reading.)

Should the state educational authorities exercise supervision over the educational work of orphan asylums and kindred institutions?

The CHAIRMAN. The first speaker on that topic is Dr. Elmer E. Brown, Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF DR. ELMER E. BROWN, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION.

Doctor BROWN. It would hardly be fitting that any detailed discussion of this subject should be undertaken here. It is rather in place that some restatement of the general principles which are to guide in these concerns should be attempted.

Let us first note the fact that education has come to be a primary purpose in our provision for dependent children. It is no longer subsidiary to care for their physical life and for their salvation, as religion conceives it. This is because of our growing sense that education has a great deal to do in the long run with both their physical and their spiritual well-being, and that it is moreover not only a means to the ends which the State has in view in what it does for all of its citizens, but is quite as much the end to which the other agencies of the State are a means. While physical and spiritual care are both indispensable, we now regard the education of the child as equally indispensable, and all three are found to be so intimately bound together that if education suffers all other interests of childhood suffer with it.

I think this represents a real change in our attitude toward all modern problems into which education enters as a possible factor. It is a change which has come about so gradually that we hardly realize how far it has gone. But the new attitude must be reckoned with in all that we may do, in our modern ways, for the welfare of children.

No State can be long indifferent if the notion comes abroad that the education of any class of its young citizens is seriously neglected. But we are easy-going, and the need of improvement at any point in our educational system does not really take hold upon us till that need is made clear in some appreciable and tangible demonstration. What is there to awaken public sentiment to the need of standards in the education of dependent children which may fairly be compared with our standards in the education of normally conditioned children?

Certain practical considerations, a great variety of them, have made us aware of the need of higher and more definite standards in our ordinary education. Our universities, our professional schools, our schools of secondary grade, and almost every other branch of our educational system, are just now under the stress of a great standardizing movement. The actual disadvantages under which the graduates of our institutions have suffered, both at home and abroad, because of the indeterminate value of their diplomas, has lent force to this movement. On the other hand, great practical advantages are now open to standard institutions and to those only that are recognized as standard institutions. Such definite advantages and disadvantages have made this a definite and powerful movement where it had previously been only the isolated aspiration and endeavor of the more far-sighted educational leaders.

Thus far but little has been done to standardize the education of those who are peculiarly the children of the State, those dependent children with whom this conference is concerned. I anticipate that two of the strongest influences which will force the question of standards to the front in this particular case are the movement for fixing the limits of child-labor and the movement in behalf of industrial

education. As our child-labor laws are perfected and their administration is perfected, we shall necessarily have a closer scrutiny of the actual attainments of the pupils who come up from all of our schools; and a well-organized industrial education will put to a severer test the preliminary training of those who are brought under its invigorating discipline. For these reasons, as for many others, there is need that the general educational forces of our time shall keep in the closest alliance with the forces of child defense and the forces of industrial instruction.

The first need is that the qualifications of teachers be guarded; then that the appliances, the hygienic conditions, and the actual instruction of pupils be held up to reasonable requirements. It is my belief that inquiry into these matters can be made by the State without the shadow of interference with any rights which may inhere in the management of privately conducted institutions. We may go further and say that the call for the standardizing of instruction in these institutions is likely to come first from the institutions themselves. Under our system any interfering inspection by state authorities is easily warded off. Public opinion is against it. A really injured institution or individual has a ready hearing at the hands of the legislative and executive authorities. Accordingly, confidence in the fairness of the State in such matters is the rule and not the exception. At the point where we are most sensitive, and ought to be most sensitive—the point of our religious convictions—there is little if any fear of encroachment from the side of the State. The managers of eleemosynary institutions, through their frequent meetings together and their periodical literature, come to be in many instances their own best critics. For all of these reasons we may expect with considerable confidence that the call for adequate assurance of the excellence of the teaching in these institutions will come in the immediate future, with increasing insistence, from the side of these institutions themselves and from the nearest friends of such institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The next speaker on this subject is Mr. William B. Streeter, superintendent North Carolina Children's Home Society.

ADDRESS OF MR. WILLIAM B. STREETER, OF GREENSBORO, N. C., SUPERINTENDENT NORTH CAROLINA CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

Mr. STREETER. Mr. Chairman, kind friends, as it appears to me there is only one side to this question, and I believe that the honorable Commissioner of Education has said practically all there is to be said on that side. You will find that what I say is simply, in a sense, a repetition of what he has already said in perhaps slightly different words. I shall by no means weary you by reason of my many words.

Believing as I do that the children of the land should have the benefit of all that is best in the matter of their training for future citizenship, I can answer the question under discussion in but one way, and that in the affirmative. To make my position plain I adopt somewhat of the Socratic plan and shall state why I so believe, how the supervision may be accomplished, and how far it should be carried.

An intelligent citizenship is essential to a State's welfare.

Such a citizenship comes from educating the children.

A State's duty to its citizens is to see that they are able to enjoy to the fullest extent their rights that are guaranteed by the fundamental law.

An education is one of those rights.

Therefore the promotion of education is one of the functions of the State most important.

Orphan and destitute children are a part of a State's assets in the form of future citizenship.

They become good or bad citizens largely as the State elects.

Education tends to render them good citizens.

Therefore their proper education is as much a part of the State's concern as is that of the others and their education should be under the supervision of the State.

Beginning with our National Bureau of Education, presided over by our honored Commissioner, and passing on to the state and county organizations, we have a body of experts constantly investigating and selecting the best that is suggested by the experience of all countries and passing it on to those who have the immediate charge of instruction.

The public school system of a State has a general superintendent and sundry local superintendents. From the office of the first issue plans for the unification and betterment of the whole system. The local superintendents look after the carrying out of these plans through their various districts, so that each child shall receive the benefit of all that experts are able to devise. The local superintendents, having immediate supervision of the schools, are the ones that carry these plans into them and see that they are adopted. As with the public schools, so should it be with the orphan asylums, that those children may have equal advantages with the others.

Fully aware that the majority of the orphan asylums are the wards of church organizations, I hold that the State should have nothing to do with the religious instruction of the children; but in the matter of their secular education I firmly believe the State should require the employment of the same grade of teachers as is required for the public schools; that it should require that the local superintendent visit and supervise the work; that the same course of study be required; and that text-books uniform with those of the public schools should be used. Under those circumstances, orphan children will stand the same show as their more fortunate fellows and, should they chance to leave the asylum before they complete their school work, they will be able to take their places beside the others and work right along with them without interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. The subject is now open for discussion. Doctor Henderson has the floor.

ADDRESS OF PROF. CHARLES RICHMOND HENDERSON, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, ILL.

Professor HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak from the standpoint of the school-teacher. That is my trade.

I want, first of all, to ask the attention of this great conference especially to the fact that the one who in other countries would be called the minister of education in the national government has addressed us. He has brought to us one of the most important sub-

jects in which we are interested here, and I hope and believe that before this conference is over we shall all have an opportunity to vote upon a resolution commending to all of our fellow-laborers in this country the establishment of a children's bureau in the Federal Government. [Applause.] At the same time I think it is only justice, it is only fairness, that in asking for this new enterprise we give all honor and praise to the splendid Bureau of Education which has already done such great service for every one of our States, and has itself been a kind of bureau to help children.

How are we to set up the highest standard? Mr. Streeter has spoken about local supervision. Many of us in the Middle West know that that kind of supervision will not be most fruitful until we get it under state direction. State supervision could establish and maintain a higher standard of work in institutions than can the county. And if we secure state legislation it will work uniformly over the commonwealth. We have the highest ideals set before us, not only of the nation, but of the world, through our federal Bureau of Education, and from it the best models are made known to all our institutions.

It is our duty in all educational enterprises to recognize expert judgment.

For example: There has been some criticism of one of the state institutions of which I am a trustee in the matter of medical care. Our first effort was to get the best medical advice and counsel in regard to the matter in question that could be had in the State of Illinois. We were also criticised for our educational methods; and there were some things that could be improved. The standard could be raised. How could we go about that? In exactly the same way; we must get the consensus of expert testimony of skillful and expert educators.

Information descends from the Federal Government to the State and to the local institutions, and expert boards of the State can offer such counsel too. We must not have it forced upon us from on high; we must hold out our hands and ask for it, and see that enlightened judgments are enforced in the details of administration. [Applause.]

**REMARKS OF MR. MICHAEL FRANCIS DOYLE, OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
VICE-PRESIDENT OF PARTICULAR COUNCIL, SOCIETY OF ST. VINCENT
DE PAUL.**

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to rise as being opposed to the proposition which is now before this conference.

I do not think that the State should have the right to regulate the education of children in any orphan asylum or kindred institution unless that asylum or institution is maintained and supported entirely by the State. The State has no right to supervise the education of children in any orphan asylum or institution of a like nature which is maintained by a religious body or by private charity, nor has it the right to say what those children should be taught, how they shall be taught, or what qualifications their teachers should possess. The unit of society is the family. The right of educating the child belongs to the head of the family and not to the State. When one of those parents has been lost, and the child is being cared for by an orphan asylum, that institution takes the place of the

parent, and knowing the particular needs of the children under its care and protection it alone should direct the education of its wards. Often a child is placed in an institution by its surviving parent, not only because of a desire to provide a home for it, but because of the educational advantages which it would secure there and which probably could not be had elsewhere. It surely can not be maintained that the State has a right to direct the teaching of the child in the home of its parents, nor is there any reason why its foster parent, the religious or charitable orphan asylum, should thus in this regard be regulated.

Surely a separate standard can not be made for each orphan asylum and surely one standard can not be made for every orphan asylum. Each has its own characteristics and peculiar merits, all of them striving at the same time to give the best education that can be given to the wards under their control, according to their requirements. The State superintendent of education, who may possibly change with every political party in power, may differ in ideas from his predecessor, and no definite standard would be maintained.

Our greatest educational institutions to-day succeed and prosper without state supervision. It is not necessary that I should refer to the great universities and colleges that have justly earned the tributes of the world and which are under private management. Girard College, one of the most renowned institutions of its kind continues in its good work, educating thousands of boys yearly, many of whom attain positions of great eminence and honor, without the supervision of the State. And from one end of the country to the other are orphan asylums maintained by religious institutions and private charities which are quietly, nobly, unselfishly doing the greatest good of mankind, whose educational work has never been questioned and yet without state supervision. Never has any complaint been made of the neglect of the education of the children in these institutions. The proposal suggested is the extreme of paternalism.

Should the State attempt to supervise the education of these children, it must necessarily decide what studies they shall pursue, what books they shall use, and who the teachers shall be. It supervises not only the pupil, but the teacher as well. It may even regulate the attire which the teacher shall wear, as has been done in Pennsylvania. It may teach history from poisoned wells; it may instruct a philosophy which those institutions may have been founded to combat. It may even direct what Bible shall be read, what chapters shall be delivered, and what parts shall be eliminated. It enters the most sacred rights of conscience, and when it directs in matters of religion or faith it molests the sanctity of the soul. It would mean the encouragement of a principle repugnant to our form of government, false to the traditions of our country, and unwarranted by the experiences of time and of nations.

Instead of state supervision conferences should be held yearly in each State, which should be attended by the heads of the various educational institutions and orphan asylums. There, by the free and untrammelled expressions of opinions, by the discussion of matters in which they are interested, by the comparison of their progress, each would gain by the experience of the other, and more effective results could be obtained than by the supervision of the State.

REMARKS OF MR. B. PICKMAN MANN, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., PRESIDENT BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the question before us is whether these institutions should be subjected to public supervision; it is not as to whether they should be subjected to public control.

It seems to me that it would not be satisfactory, for instance, for the States or the Federal Government to control the education in private institutions; but I do think they ought to have the right of visitation, and that I understand to be the right of supervision. They should be allowed to look over the institutions to see what is being done, and report upon them, but not to control them.

In that sense I think there can be no doubt that no institution, as no family, is free from the right of the State to see that it is doing what it should do, and then public opinion at least will see that what is wrong shall be corrected.

REMARKS OF MRS. WILLIAM EINSTEIN, OF NEW YORK CITY, PRESIDENT FEDERATION OF SISTERHOODS, ETC.

Mrs. EINSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the reference by Professor Henderson to an institution for girls who are wayward gives me the courage to rise and to say that in looking over this programme I notice in it, over and over again, the reference to "care of dependent children" and the mention of orphan asylums and "placing," as though those children were not doubly dependent who are without parents because they may have lost the spiritual parent instead of the physical parent.

It seems to me we have institutions in which we have boys and girls who are dependent with a capital D, who ought to be considered here. There are many institutions in which there should be supervision—not control—in which there should be a standard of education—education of the mind and more of the hand—an industrial education. Standard does not mean uniform method, by any manner of means. Uniformity, I believe, all would deprecate, because uniformity tends to kill initiative. I mean an enforced uniformity, but standard is something we ought to have. We should have inspection of every institution which has any girl or boy under the age of 21, in order that that girl or boy shall be that which, in a democracy, we have the first right to demand, a good citizen, making future good citizens. [Applause.]

The question of education should not bring in at all the question of religion, for in this country we have separated them, and happily there is an unwritten law that in all of our state institutions where religious instruction under and by the State is forbidden, there is free entrance to Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, that they minister in those institutions to those who need this particular thing, and I believe no one would wish to interfere with that free ministration for those who are born in a certain faith.

We all know of institutions in which, under the guise of teaching industry, there is labor; and labor is a very different thing from industry, labor making things which are sold in the open market. This is in private institutions. These things we should look into. We should see to it that the methods which are now so pressed for reformation are equally considered for formation.

Some of you may have read a few years ago a little story in one of the magazines, in which a poor little boy who had been in a reformatory where he got good education, mental and industrial, after coming out committed a breach against our so-called laws for our protection and merely for the conservation of property, and for the opposite sometimes, for the conservation of the best in human nature, wherein this poor child committed an offense against the laws and ordinances, in order that he might get an education. Such a standard as that we should establish, and such a standard we can get only by state inspection, recorded and enforced by public opinion—a state inspection which shall say, “There shall be no institution in which there shall not be training.” The training given in the institution to-day is, perhaps, better than in the home, because to-day, in many a home, there has disappeared the sort of training which existed in the home of the past, from which there was not taken by modern industry all of the industrial discipline which there was in those days. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF MR. HENRY W. THURSTON, OF CHICAGO, ILL., CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER, JUVENILE COURT.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, there is just one field in which the application of the state supervision of education should not be neglected. I refer to the great number of detention homes which are being established in connection with the juvenile courts, and these temporary homes for dependent children.

Just as Mr. Birtwell said, the child, to-day, the next hour, should be brought in contact with the home, if possible; so that at the very moment the State does take hold of the dependent or delinquent child the educational process should be set up in these detention homes. The most inspiring places that I find just now in connection with the juvenile court work are those schoolrooms for the children that are there one hour, two hours, two days, or two weeks; and we must not overlook that field of educational opportunity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further speakers on this subject, we will go to the next, which is topic No. 10. Will the secretary read it?

The SECRETARY (reading):

Should every child-caring agency—

(a) Secure full information concerning the character and circumstances of the parents or surviving parent or near relatives of each child admitted to its care, through personal investigation by its own representative, unless adequate information is supplied by some admitting agency.

(b) Inform itself by personal investigation at least once each year of the circumstances of the parents or surviving parent of children in its charge, unless this information is supplied by some other responsible agency.

(c) Exercise supervision over children leaving their care until such children become self-supporting, unless such children are legally adopted or returned to their parents.

(d) Make a permanent record of all the information thus secured.

The CHAIRMAN. This session will last fifteen or twenty minutes longer. Some of these propositions in the list seem so obvious that unless somebody asks for the floor against them, they will be considered as the sense of the meeting.

Is there anybody who cares to talk against proposition 10 or against any part of it?

ADDRESS OF MR. CHARLES W. BIRTWELL, OF BOSTON, MASS., GENERAL SECRETARY, BOSTON CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.

Mr. BIRTWELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that it seems to me we are writing ourselves down as in the A B C of the development of child caring and placing out, when we use under (b) the phrase "at least once each year." Clause (b) should read something like this: "To keep themselves informed of the circumstances of parents." We see traces of the same kind of error in discussions as to how often placed-out children should be visited, and other placing-out questions.

REMARKS OF MR. JAMES E. WEST, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., SECRETARY NATIONAL CHILD-RESCUE LEAGUE.

Mr. WEST (secretary). Mr. Chairman, I am glad that Mr. Birtwell has such an advanced view, and I wish it were possible that some of those to whom his message would be of practical value were here to listen to him. But it came to the knowledge of the committee which framed these resolutions that there were in the United States institutions receiving children where the records had nothing to show for a period of three or four or five years, whether the surviving parent had since died or become a millionaire or what not. Personally, I know of a case where an institution received three children supposing that the father was dead. The mother was living and had a good income as a trained nurse. For three years the father of the children maintained a butcher shop directly across the street, or diagonally across the street, from the institution, and the officers or managers of the institution knew nothing about it.

So I say it would be desirable to have some of the institutions make investigations at least once a year; but I agree with Mr. Birtwell that it would be far more desirable if they did so more often, and I quite cheerfully accept his remonstrance. More, I will gladly convey it to the committee on resolutions, and have that point made a little stronger, if the committee can do so.

REMARKS OF REV. WALTER REID HUNT, OF ORANGE, N. J., PRESIDENT CHILDREN'S AID AND PROTECTIVE SOCIETY OF THE ORANGES, ETC.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, let us put ourselves squarely on record in regard to this matter of proper investigation. I represent a child-caring society which does most of its work in maintaining homes and making deserting parents come back and support their children, but we do have some child-placing-out work to do.

In the last week, probably as a result of the President of the United States calling this conference, the orphan home, so called, of the city where I live turned over to our society some four or five children to be placed out. What information did they give us in regard to those children? One was a foundling picked up two years ago, and that was all they knew about the child. They could not give us facts to prove even in what town the child was found. Two of the children were illegitimate, and neither of the parents of either of the children was known. One of the children was an orphan, whose father died before the child came to the home, and whose mother, after putting the child into the home, paid part of its support for

two years and then went to Sweden, intending to return. She died over there. Word came back by returning friends, working girls of the city, that the grandparents would take that child to Sweden and take care of it. The officers of the institution, instead of sending the child over, because it was not convenient, waited a while longer, and then word came back through other returning friends that the grandparents could not take the child. No effort was made to locate the grandparents or to communicate directly with them.

That is all the information we could work upon as a basis for placing out those children, and when we wrote for further information the reply came back from the secretary of the board, "The children were given to you for adoption, and we do not see what need you have for any further information whatever." We had the children, what need did we have for information? [Laughter.]

Now, those are conditions that exist. Mr. Birtwell pictures the ideal conditions. We face the actual conditions.

If this conference can go on record as advocating adequate, thorough, and competent investigation of all the circumstances which have brought the child to the care of the society or institution, so that when I go back I can show these people what is the consensus of opinion of the people who are giving time and thought to this business, it will be a great help. We want something besides heart in all this work; we want some headwork to go with it.

When I went to the chairman of the board of trustees of that institution, she said to me, "Mr. Hunt, we have had perfect harmony on our board for something like twenty years." I said, "There has been harmony in a graveyard ever since the first corpse was put into the ground." [Laughter.] I said further, "When harmony interferes with efficient service for the work we are consecrated to do, and which we hold as trustees, harmony in the board must give way, and intelligent child-caring come in to take its place." [Applause.]

REMARKS OF MR. SUMNER W. HAYNES, OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND., SUPERINTENDENT INDIANA CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

Mr. HAYNES. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought not to pass this over lightly. It is all right for Mr. Birtwell and Mr. Stone and Mr. Pear and these other Massachusetts people to rest easy. They will not take a child until they know all that is to be known about that child.

I have in mind now a few children—some 60 or 70—that I found in our children's home when I took charge of the work three months ago. One child is as bright as a whip, can sing, can write a splendid letter, and is bright in mind and healthy in body. I could not understand why this child did not get into a home readily; but I find that his parents are both living, and, as far as the child is concerned, worse than dead. The father is a drunkard, but outside of that he is an honorable man; he does not steal. However, the imbecility caused by drunkenness seems to have bred into this boy a desire to steal and to burn.

In another case, a family of five children came to me. The mother, I learned, died suddenly of some disease, and the father was killed in a railroad accident; but the children were clean in mind and in body—not educated, but clean. Why, the demands for those children when these facts became known were so great that the trouble was to select the home best fitted.

You can not treat these children unless you know them when they come to you, and I think that we men who are young in this business ought to hear some discussion on this subject by men of experience. That is why we are here; not simply that you may hear yourselves, but that we may hear you. [Laughter.]

REMARKS OF REV. C. EISSFELDT, OF WAUWATOSA, WIS., GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT LUTHERAN KINDERFREUND SOCIETIES.

Mr. EISSFELDT. Clauses *b*, *c*, and *d*, are enacted into the statutes of Wisconsin under which we work.

In connection with No. 2, "Should the State inspect the work of child-caring agencies," it seems to me that working under such a statute is quite a happy solution, as far as we can now see; and if every State would have such a statute having these *b*, *c*, and *d* in it, and having the inspection of the State, whether this was in force or not, I do not know at present of any better solution of this question.

I think *a* should read, "secure as full information as possible." Very often it is not possible.

Now, about foundlings. We have had a foundling where the history was one sentence, "Found at 220 Walnut street by an officer," and it was not possible to get any more family history. It was not full information—in one way, it was.

So I think that should read "as full information as possible." I suppose that is what is meant.

The SECRETARY. That is what is meant; yes, sir.

Mr. EISSFELDT. I think we all agree to that.

Mr. HUNT. In regard to the foundling I referred to, we tried to find out in what town the child was found, and we could not even find that.

REMARKS OF MR. WILLIAM H. PEAR, OF BOSTON, MASS., GENERAL AGENT BOSTON PROVIDENT ASSOCIATION, ETC.

Mr. PEAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge the substitution of a phrase for a word in the first part of section 10. Instead of saying that we should find out the facts in regard to each child admitted, I think we should say, in regard to each child in whose behalf application is made.

There is a very pathetic story of an old lady who, although wretchedly poor and in ill health, persisted in looking on the bright side. When asked what in the world she had to be thankful for, she replied that while it was true that she had but two teeth in her head, she was grateful for the fact that they met. [Laughter.] I submit that this fortunate contact is too often lacking in the case of many child-helping institutions and the community problems which they should touch; that if we can secure it we shall have some surprising results. We shall find, for one thing, that what Doctor Reeder speaks of as "the only real thing," the child's own home, is the thing for many of these children that apply to the institutions; that we face a family relief problem or a home readjustment problem, and not a simple case of child need. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say that we may well find that "the real thing" is still possible for these children, and that when

we get at the correlation of our problems we shall discover that our child-caring institutions, can not stand with its doors wide open, simply studying the question whether a child shall be admitted or not. We shall discover that there are more fundamental questions to be asked, namely: What is the nature and what the cause of the child's need; is it child need or family need; what is the best remedy? There are two ways in which such inquiry is now being made. One way is employed in Massachusetts. (I dislike to talk any more of Massachusetts, especially as I am the last speaker.) There, several of the child-caring institutions go into the inquiry individually, employing an expert investigator who finds out the facts in regard to each child for whom application is made; this involves close cooperation and exchange of information. The other way is exemplified in that very interesting experiment which is now being tried in Philadelphia and in Newark, and, for all I know, elsewhere—I hope elsewhere, too—where there is a separate bureau which studies these facts, makes diagnoses, and refers to the proper agency, it may be to a child-helping society or to a relief society. In these ways, I submit, we establish the contact needed between the child-helping agency and the community's problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The secretary will read the next two subjects together.

The SECRETARY. I almost feel like apologizing for reading the next topic, but when the committee were informed that there were in the United States to-day over 8,000 children in almshouses, it was thought wise to put this protest in. [Reading:]

11. Should the sending of children to almshouses and their care therein be forbidden by law?

12. Should all agencies for placing children in families make a thorough investigation of the character and circumstances of all applications for children, including a personal visit to each family before placing a child therein? Should all such agencies exercise close and careful supervision over all children placed in families, such supervision to include personal visitation by trained agents and careful inquiry as to the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual training of each child?

The CHAIRMAN. As to these propositions, I will recognize first anybody who wants to talk against them. They seem to be so obvious that there will be little need of discussion in their favor, unless somebody is prepared to take the negative. Is there anybody ready to take the negative?

Mr. MANN. I move we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. If not, we will give six minutes to two speakers—three minutes each. Who cares to speak on the affirmative of these propositions?

(Doctor McKenna was rising.)

REMARKS OF DR. CHARLES F. MCKENNA, OF NEW YORK CITY, SECRETARY CATHOLIC HOME BUREAU, ETC.

Doctor McKenna. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the committee should have prepared these questions in this form: "Should children be admitted to almshouses?" That question I am ready to speak on in the negative.

The other question contains several subdivisions. I only rise to speak on that because I have heard several appeals from the floor

and from the secretary to have the proponents of the active placing-out societies make themselves better heard and to speak in favor of these propositions, because while, as we see, there are none that have any elements for serious dissent, the principles of child care should be well enunciated.

In question 12 are first principles, and they are the only principles upon which placing out should be done.

We have heard much criticism of the institutions. I am not critical of the member of any board of any institution. I leave him to his God. But I am very critical of myself and my duties and responsibilities which have come to me without my asking, and I am very critical of every member of our board. The dead ones we buried long ago. Our cemetery is outside of our office. We have no dead ones within. With such an active board and an active executive committee and a loyal force working under us, we are able to carry out, to a considerable extent, the features contained in the principles stated here.

But perhaps it would be well for me to try to reach the public of this country with simply the cry of duty. Let every man and every woman in this country ask themselves what is their duty in a particular matter, and if they have an open place by their hearthstone, and they hear that call to duty from this conference, they will open more fields for our work of charity. Let every man who finds himself in any position on a board of any such institution, whether a so-called "institutional" institution or a placing-out institution, examine his conscience and see if he is performing his duty. And let me sound a warning to all placing-out societies. They will be told by those who perhaps are opposed to the proposition that they are riding a hobby. Let me warn them to be careful that they are not doing so. Let them see that five, ten, fifteen, twenty, or fifty years hence no evils will have crept into their work such as we hear criticised in the institution. The fly wheel is in motion, the machinery is all working; but let not a single child in any number of years in the future be ground up in that machinery. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERRARD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who occupied the chair before you ruled that I could present some resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN. I shall call for those in a moment.

REMARKS OF MRS. FREDERIC SCHOFF, OF PHILADELPHIA, PA., PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL CONGRESS OF MOTHERS.

Mrs. SCHOFF. Mr. Chairman, since the establishment of juvenile courts and laws forbidding the confinement of children in police stations or prisons, awaiting hearing, it has become mandatory in many States for county commissioners to provide accommodations in rooms or building for the dependent, neglected, delinquent, and incorrigible children whose cases are awaiting disposition by the court. This opens a way to care for the children now held in almshouses in a place provided for children exclusively.

This may meet the question that may be asked as to what can be done with the children whom almshouses are forbidden to receive. Each one should be placed as soon as possible with the sanction and record of the court.

REMARKS OF MR. CHARLES W. BIRTWELL, OF BOSTON, MASS., GENERAL SECRETARY, BOSTON CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.

MR. BIRTWELL. Mr. Chairman, looking at paragraph C of topic No. 10, I find it reads: "Exercise supervision over children leaving their care until such children become self-supporting——" Of course, the phrase "leaving their care" is wrong, because the children have not left their care. The boys and girls are still in their care, even when transferred from the institution to families. Then the suggestion that such oversight and supervision might appropriately cease when children become self-supporting is also wrong. When boys and girls fourteen or fifteen years of age begin to earn wages is no time to cease the supervision. They need friends for years afterwards, just as surely as they need them during earlier years.

THE CHAIRMAN. The resolutions may now be offered and will, without discussion, be referred to the committee on resolutions. Mr. Sherrard has some resolutions to offer. If you will pass them up, the secretary will read them.

MR. SHERRARD. I can hardly read my own writing, and I do not believe anybody else can.

(The resolutions are as follows:)

Whereas those engaged in the development of benevolent work dealing with children view with alarm the rising tide of illegitimacy which is sweeping over the land, as is evidenced by the rapidly increasing number of maternity homes, baby farms, and kindred agencies for the care of infants; and

Whereas it is essential that a knowledge of the conditions as they exist be given to the public; and

Whereas state boards of health are inadequate to the task of constructing a system of regulation which will be accurate to a degree that will command the confidence of the nation; therefore

Resolved, That this conference respectfully request the Congress of the United States to establish a bureau of vital statistics whereby all births shall be recorded, and also the fact as to whether the child was born in wedlock or not, and, if so, whether husband and wife are living together.

Whereas it is the sense of this conference that the subsidization of private charities by the State is an evil second only to the state support of churches; therefore

Resolved, That we recommend to the legislatures of the several States that they discontinue the practice of taking money out of the treasury for the support of private charities.

THE CHAIRMAN. The resolutions will be referred to the committee on resolutions. Are there any other resolutions? If not, announcements will be made by the secretary.

THE SECRETARY. The meeting this afternoon will be at 2 o'clock in this room. It is essential that we start promptly, and therefore I will make the announcements very brief, so that you will have enough time for lunch.

The committee on arrangements instruct me to say that the few people who are given visitors' tickets are requested to be seated this afternoon on the right-hand side in the rear; that only those holding credentials from the President of the United States will be permitted to speak on the propositions this afternoon and recognized in any vote which may be taken. That will be necessary in order that we may proceed in a businesslike way.

The committee on resolutions has been in session practically all night and all morning, and it is hoped we will be able to present our report this afternoon at 4 o'clock.

It is earnestly hoped that everybody interested in this matter, no matter what his interest may be, be present promptly, so that we may get through with the business this afternoon in sufficient time to enable us to get to the dinner at 7.30.

The CHAIRMAN. The session stands adjourned until 2 o'clock sharp.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

BOARD ROOM OF THE DISTRICT BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1909.

The conference was called to order at 2 o'clock p. m. by the chairman (Mr. Homer Folks).

DISCUSSION ON TOPIC No. 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The topics for discussion this afternoon are Nos. 9, 1, 13, and 14. I will ask the secretary to read topic No. 9.

The secretary read as follows:

Would it be helpful and desirable if some permanent committee or organization comparable to the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, The national child labor committee, etc., could be established for the purpose of carrying on an active propaganda with a view of securing better laws in relation to children, better organization of child-caring agencies, and better methods of relief and aid to children throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The discussion of this subject will be opened by Mr. Charles W. Birtwell, General Secretary, Boston Children's Aid Society. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. CHARLES W. BIRTWELL, GENERAL SECRETARY, BOSTON CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.

Mr. BIRTWELL. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have no speech prepared on this subject, but I have been thinking of it from time to time, as all of you probably have, as you have noticed the subject on our programme. The first thing that we must bear in mind is that there is no necessary value in a new committee or a new organization. The tendency within us to get together when we need to get together has brought us here. A group of us thought we were inviting the President to invite us, and the President thought he was inviting us; but it was not so at all. We were invited by the things that are moving in the hearts of men. The invitation sprang up in this year because this was the year for the invitation to flower, for this meeting to occur.

Now, those things that are back of this meeting will be back of it to-morrow, though we simply say, "We have had a discussion; now let us go home."

Cardinal Manning said that in Great Britain if you wanted to bury a thing you should have a royal commission appointed and get out a blue book.

The creation of a new committee or a new organization does not insure anything being done. Some of you have heard me quote Dr. Edward Everett Hale's definition of a board—"A thing that is long and narrow and never comes to a point." The sun of progress sometimes seems almost darkened by the multiplication of com-

mittees and organizations. The air is murky with them. We must beware lest we be organized to death. Yet a great deal of the work of the world is done by committees and boards and societies, and we want to keep an open mind, and when the business involved in a given situation calls for the creation of another committee, another board, another commission, another society, we want to be brave enough to have the committee appointed, to have the organization created. And it seems to me, so far as I can think the problem out, that there ought to be some simple organization—call it a committee rather than a society—whose interest and vision should include the entire range of problems in regard to dependent children.

I should say that the committee ought scrupulously to refrain from becoming executive, because the work itself belongs to the whole people. It is only by the infinite multiplication of short-range work that we can have that pervasive helpfulness and service which will every year at a billion points stop the poison from flowing, while at the same time steadily there develops a great statesmanlike programme for preventing the very miseries that this pervasive helpfulness aims to relieve. We want not an executive society, but a group or committee to stimulate people here, there, everywhere, to get to their work. Further, that committee must wear no gag. We want the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The time is not ripe for any committee, Mr. Chairman, or any organization on this subject to be organized unless the group of men and women called together dare look straight at their subject and into the face of their God and say to the "principalities and powers" about them, "We are concerned only with the interests of unfortunate children." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The discussion will be continued by Mrs. John M. Glenn, formerly of Baltimore, now happily of New York. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MRS. JOHN M. GLENN, FORMERLY SECRETARY CHARITY ORGANIZATION SOCIETY OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mrs. GLENN. I speak in the affirmative. I agree as to the dangers Mr. Birtwell has pointed out, but I think the time has come for the formation of this particular association, and I do not consider that the formation of such an association in any way makes negative the importance of a federal children's bureau.

In the discussion we have had here yesterday and to-day there are certain things which have been very emphatically brought out, and these can be furthered by the formation of such an association. I think the most important fact that has been brought out is that we have got to come face to face all over this country with what it is going to cost us to do the work we are undertaking. We have got to realize that when West Virginia, as was stated this morning, is paying \$6,000 for its placing-out work, and Massachusetts is paying over \$600,000, there is a discrepancy that we must face. Of course the problem in West Virginia is not comparable to the problem in Massachusetts. The smaller population, in spite of the larger territory, the differences due to immigration, make the problems not comparable, but the disproportionate cost has no real relation to the mere difference of degree.

So one task for such an association is to do propaganda work that will teach the people of the country as a whole the fact that it is going to be expensive to do our work, and that we have to face and

meet the cost. Massachusetts will stand at the head of the placing-out work of this country just so long as that community is public spirited enough to pay into the societies doing her placing-out work the means that will give them a sufficient number of agents. Would not the societies of Baltimore, Philadelphia, or any other of our cities be prepared to engage the number of agents that is needed if those communities faced the cost?

Another point that has been very emphatically brought out at these meetings is that we need to get more at the results of our work. We need to get the benefit of our accumulating data; to draw out of the pigeonholes in which they are placed the facts contained in our records; and, also, to get more facts from which to draw our conclusions. What becomes of the children placed out? What becomes of the children that are in the institutions? I think that we shall learn more to draw upon our records when we have an association that stands for educative work.

Another point that was brought out in the meeting this morning is the fact that we need to correlate our experiences. An English social philosopher has said that we do not necessarily learn from our experiences. We can only learn from our experiences when we correlate them. I believe such an association may stand for a correlation of experience that will be enlightening.

At the meeting last evening one of the speakers quoted a Frenchman who has written on Saxon supremacy. When two or three years ago some social workers in England wanted to lay emphasis upon the importance of the home, what did they do? They sent to Paris and asked M. Demolins if he would not come to England and put before a group of social students in London the importance of the facts he had discovered in his work in France.

I think we need an association that is going to interpret to the country as a whole some of the facts being learned in certain sections of the country. We need to draw upon our people in Massachusetts, it may be, as Mr. Hart has done, or in other sections, for the advance knowledge they have acquired by persistent work, as was done in England when M. Demolins was called to London.

I speak as a southern woman. I am a southern woman, and I think that in the South we need to have interpreted to us in a more virile way than has been interpreted to us in the past experiences that have been gained in the North and are being gained in the West. Therefore, as a southern woman, I should heartily welcome the formation of an association that would serve to interpret in a more definite way the need of advance movements.

Mr. Roosevelt said yesterday that in the final analysis it is the human equation that counts. If an association is formed that is made up of a large group of individuals, selected because of political affiliation, because of the importance of placating certain interests, then such an association will belong to the graveyard in which so many past associations have been interred. But if there be a small association, appointed to do extensive work, to do extension work, that will serve to interpret the movements that are going on in this country, that will serve to correlate our experiences, that will serve to show people what is the cost of their undertakings, then I believe such an association is one that we have reached the point of demanding.

The National Conference of Charities and Correction has for all these years stood as an open forum for our discussions, as have also a number of national and state gatherings. In addition to the open forum we now need the intensive work of an extension department.

We are launched on a very long voyage. If we are going to do for the children of this country what ought to be done, if we in a true sense are going to meet the problem, we must prepare ourselves for the voyage. Mr. Folks has said in his book on "Destitute, Neglected, and Delinquent Children" that in 1790 Charleston founded the first children's institution. When that children's institution was formed the little ship embarked on a very clear sea. It was an open sea. But when we embark now on our projects of child-caring work, we are in troublous waters. There are innumerable craft, and if we are going to continue upon our way and have the communication that is necessary between all these various craft, we need to be prepared to make the communication direct, to make it scientific. We have to draw on the experiences of the last few days. Let our *Republic* be prepared to make communication with *Florida* if necessary.

I therefore plead for an association which will stand for such communication with different parts of this country as will make us scientifically reach for each one of our craft. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The subject is now open for discussion by the conference, the time limit being five minutes for each speaker. The chair will recognize Miss Curtis.

Miss CURTIS. I should like to ask whether the association suggested would act as a committee appointed by representatives of different parts of the country—that is to say, a voluntary joining of such an association—or whether there would be a centralized force and an appointment in preparation for a children's bureau by the National Government. It seems to me there would be a great difference between the two, and that the voluntary association or the different representatives of different parts of the country, in making these preliminary investigations and in forming and acquiring knowledge and facts on these different subjects, would be a most natural outgrowth of conferences like this, and the most natural preparation for a formal bureau, but I should like to know what the proposition is for the appointment of such an association.

The CHAIRMAN. Speaking for the committee on preliminary arrangements, and recalling the suggestions made that this topic be placed on the programme, I should say that there is no one in position to answer specifically the last question as to who should name the proposed committee, but that it was evidently the intention of those who spoke on this subject that it should be a permanent—humanly speaking, permanent—voluntary, an entirely unofficial organization, whose work would not be discontinued or made unnecessary in any degree by the establishment of a federal children's bureau, the one being an official organ and the other an entirely voluntary unofficial society or committee.

REMARKS OF MR. JAMES E. WEST, SECRETARY NATIONAL CHILD RESCUE LEAGUE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Answering the inquiry further, and speaking in explanation of the proposition, I would like to say that even if the children's bureau bill becomes a law, as I hope everyone here will help to make possible,

there is a great field for work by some such organization as is suggested by the topic under consideration. Perhaps there is no more splendid demonstration of expert action than the development in the last ten years, the marvelous development in the last ten years, of the work of the organization known as the Young Men's Christian Association. They have, without any authority, by maintaining a central committee, known as the international committee, succeeded in more than trebling in the last five years the property value and the scope of the work of that organization.

The record for the last year is marvelous in itself.

That is done by means of this international committee employing men who are on their jobs, who know their subjects. For instance, we in the city of Washington here for some six years attempted in our feeble way to secure funds for a Young Men's Christian Association. Finally, by the grace of God, a business man was persuaded to undertake the leadership of our movement, and he naturally wanted to know the best way to proceed to secure results. He was willing to do what the board were probably a little jealous of doing before; he was willing to invite expert services of the international committee to assist in organizing their campaign for the Young Men's Christian Association in the city. Without going into detail I can say that by calling upon the international committee to send to Washington a man whose specialty it was to raise funds for building purposes, within thirty days the Young Men's Christian Association in the city of Washington raised a fund of \$300,000, and the building about which they had been talking for six years was in a short time a reality.

There has come to me in the last year and a half, and especially since this conference was first spoken of, numerous letters from all parts of the country from this and that organization asking if some one could work with the local board in thrashing out this or that proposition. There is one organization in South Carolina which has planned to reinvest its money. They are going to build a new institution. They would like to have expert advice as to how to go about it. In another section of the country I know of a fraternal order which would like to know upon whom it can call for assistance and expert advice along another line. Without going into details you can just see the great possibility there is for a committee employing the best that there is available for work along special lines and making available those people to all parts of the country only upon request. If an organization in San Francisco wants the services of some one whom this committee would employ, the committee would not act until it was requested to do so, and then the action of the committee would only be advisory. It would have no authority; it would simply act in cooperation with existing organizations to give to them the benefit of the best that is obtainable.

As to the composition of the committee, it would seem to me that that is a matter of future development. If Mr. Carnegie could be persuaded to do for the human being what he is doing for science, I should say that Mr. Carnegie would desire the privilege of saying who should be the trustees of the fund or who should control it. He would certainly secure the advice of people who are experts on the subject. I myself am not concerned as to who appoints the committee or how it is done. I am concerned, though, to have this body say that there is a field of usefulness for some such work. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize Mrs. Streeter, of New Hampshire.

REMARKS OF MRS. FRANK S. STREETER, CHAIRMAN STATE BOARD OF CHARITIES AND CORRECTIONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Mrs. STREETER. Speaking from the point of view of one who is working for children in a State where practically no system exists, and not only that but no public opinion exists to support the modern placing-out system, I would say that the formation of such a committee would be of inestimable value to those living in remote States, away from the great centers, who need the help and cooperation of the more advanced States. I can hardly imagine anything that would be of greater help to us than such an organization, which would help us to establish a modern placing-out system of caring for our dependent children, assist us in the discussion of these questions, disseminate literature, and in every way help us in influencing public opinion to bring about a better condition of affairs. I am heartily in favor of the suggested committee. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize Mrs. Schoff, of Philadelphia.

REMARKS OF MRS. FREDERIC SCHOFF, PRESIDENT NATIONAL CONGRESS OF MOTHERS.

Mrs. SCHOFF. I think that such a committee could be of a great deal of use. I represent an organization that for ten years has had for one of its objects the extension of propaganda for the care of helpless children. I see a way in which it can be done, in a very practical and important manner. One of the things that has brought us together is the fact that a magazine, not devoted to charitable work, has extended a knowledge of the needs of these dependent children to people that do not come to charity conferences, and who do not know anything about them. We have to reach those people. If such a committee had headquarters here in Washington and a press bureau that was continually sending out information all over the country, to every little county and town in this country, telling of the needs of these dependent and neglected children, we would arouse a sentiment that would enable us to find homes for them and to do a great deal more for them than ever has been done before.

I am very heartily in favor of what Mrs. Glenn says about the importance of carrying the thing to a conclusion so as to get results. I believe there is use for such a committee. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. GEORGE B. ROBINSON, OF NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. ROBINSON. I merely wish to express my desire that such an organization as this may be effected. One reason for this, Mr. Chairman, the lady who has last spoken very well illustrated. I wonder what we would do in America to-day without a magazine that is published under the auspices of the United Charities of New York City? [Applause.] I wonder how the people of our city would be educated on this great subject? I wonder how they would discover the ideas of other people as to how to do things in the line of helping in this work if it were not for such a magazine? But the

magazine is but an illustration of what might be accomplished if all of our ideas were correlated, as Mrs. Glenn has so well said—if all of our experiences were correlated into the hands of a committee, from which it might be shown that these ideas had been in a unifying course throughout the whole country.

I agree with the gentleman from Boston that the air is murky with organizations, but the air is murky for the want of one organization, one unifying organization of all the organizations. If the proposed creation of a committee like this will lead to this result, I can think of nothing that will be more hopeful. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if anyone present desires to speak in the negative of the proposition as stated? If so, the Chair would feel that he must recognize anyone so desiring to speak.

REMARKS OF MISS LILLIAN D. WALD, MEMBER NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE.

Miss WALD. I am to have an opportunity this evening of speaking at greater length upon the Children's Bureau within the Federal Government, but I want to say just a few words in this discussion. I believe that all that Mrs. Glenn has said would apply with even greater force as arguments for the creation of that bureau. The air is murky with many organizations, and sad is the fact that the same people are so frequently called upon to devote themselves to so many different phases of social endeavor.

That seems to me to be a logical reason for creating within the Government some central bureau that would possess all the facts, that would pass upon them and separate them and diffuse them, so that all the elements of society in the various betterment schemes for the children should have the right to apply and to hold the Government responsible for giving them the latest scientific word upon the subject.

For that reason, inasmuch as it might confuse the issue that we may agree upon, I should discourage the suggestion of creating another society and focus all of our attention, if possible, upon making the Government itself responsible for informing and giving education to all of the people who are already interested in the children and to stimulate those communities that have not expressed themselves forcibly as yet for the children. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. B. PICKMAN MANN, PRESIDENT BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MANN. I would like to say one word about the desirability of having such a committee as is suggested, in addition to any national bureau, and that is that under the laws of the United States it is illegal for any federal official body to accept voluntary assistance unless there be special legislation therefor. Now, an unofficial body of this kind could call upon the community for help, and advice and assistance; but if the United States body undertakes to call for any voluntary assistance, or friendly aid, it is against the law. It is not always observed, but nevertheless it is the case. It is a disability which the government bureau would have under the law.

REMARKS OF MR. MORNAY WILLIAMS, CHAIRMAN NEW YORK CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely rise for the purpose of making a statement, lest it be thought that there was not another side to the subject. I do not desire to make an argument this afternoon on the proposition before us, but I do desire to say very emphatically that I entirely agree with what Miss Wald has said. I want to state this evening, when I shall have the privilege of speaking, some of the reasons why I favor a national bureau, and not an individual one. I do not desire to repeat that talk now, but I do desire to make it known that there are at least a few here who have been doing some thinking along this line, and are not prepared to say that the time has come when the best work can be done by this sort of an association or committee.

ADDRESS OF MR. HUGH F. FOX, PRESIDENT STATE BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS OF NEW JERSEY.

Mr. Fox. I am sorry I have not heard all of the discussion this afternoon, but I want to emphasize Miss Wald's argument. It may perhaps be worth while calling your attention to the fact that there are already a number of national organizations in existence which are dealing with the child problem. For example, there is the National Child Labor Committee, the National Play Ground Movement, the General Alliance of Workers with Boys; there is a national organization to consider the problems of backward and defective children; a movement has been recently organized in connection with school hygiene; the boys' club workers of the Y. M. C. A. have their own national association. There is a National Association for Industrial Education, a National Humane Alliance, and a national association of the various children's home societies. Now comes this proposition to form another national organization which shall not be a combination of all these interests, but will be a new movement to deal with dependent children. Unless its financial status is well assured at the start I question the wisdom of it, and in any case it must not be allowed to weaken the movement for a federal children's bureau.

ADDRESS OF HENRY W. THURSTON, CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER, JUVENILE COURT, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. THURSTON. I do not know that I shall add to the negative of this discussion very much, but I confess that I can not see yet clearly the function of this committee as distinguished from the children's bureau. Coming down we made some notations on these various questions, and one of the programs was glanced over by another gentleman, and the program which was glanced over had, in answer to this query: "No; unless the function can be very clearly pointed out in the conference, and unless funds can be seen clearly available for the carrying on of such work."

You have already had mentioned the recent formation of the National Juvenile Court Society, which was aimed to cover only a part of this field. One of the reasons why that has been ineffective is not that there is not a great desire and need for information for

standardizing the work of the juvenile courts of the country, but that there was no fund or no person available for furnishing information which exists in one part of the country to another.

I simply rise as one who is not clear headed yet as to the difference in function and to the source of support for this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bernstein, will you take the chair?

(Mr. Bernstein took the chair.)

ADDRESS OF MR. HOMER FOLKS, SECRETARY STATE CHARITIES AID ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK.

Mr. FOLKS. I wish to participate a moment in the discussion of this subject, because it seems to me that both this and the following proposition should be answered in the affirmative. I think we mistake the functions of government and those of private initiative, if it seems to us that there is not a field for both in this work, national in scope, for dependent children. There is, and must always be, a difference between the work that is proper to an organization which is a part of the machinery of the government, which is bound to represent all the people, and that of a society which is not bound to represent anything except its own members and its own particular views.

As you perhaps know, my work has been chiefly in connection with a private society, a society for the improvement of public charitable institutions. Our existence and our work have not diminished the scope nor interfered with the work of an official state board; still less that of public charitable institutions.

On the other hand, the extent to which we have succeeded in educating public opinion, in arousing interest in the subject, in seeing and doing the very things that an official board could not see and do, has made it possible for that official organization to become stronger, to have its work extended, and to have additional and important powers and duties placed upon it.

It would be, in my judgment, a mistake for the federal children's bureau to undertake many of the things which would be extremely proper and extremely desirable for a voluntary association to undertake. It would be extremely improper for a voluntary association to undertake to perform the duties that might by law be imposed upon a federal bureau. Mr. West very clearly indicated the possible scope and usefulness of such an organization, and I for one believe that no group of people who might be selected as representative of the care of dependent children, as represented in this conference, would form such an organization or undertake to carry the work on unless they had the means with which to work. I believe we should favor the establishment of such a committee or organization—that is, that we should answer this question in the affirmative.

Assuming that there should be such a voluntary association and that it had funds with which to work, I believe the federal bureau would be strengthened thereby. Its possibilities would be greatly enlarged by the existence of a voluntary group of citizens, free to express their views on all subjects at all times, and thereby to make possible the molding of public opinion which later on would permit official action and official expression, which might not safely be taken at an earlier date. [Applause.]

(Thereupon Mr. Folks resumed the chair.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. West desires to speak again, and can do so only by unanimous consent.

Mr. WEST. I had something to do with making these rules, and I will willingly suffer as a result thereof if the conference desires I should do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Is unanimous consent extended to Mr. West? [After a pause] It is, Mr. West.

REMARKS OF MR. JAMES E. WEST, SECRETARY NATIONAL CHILD RESCUE LEAGUE.

Mr. WEST. I would be false to my colors, false to my feelings and principles, if I did not stand upon this floor and resent most respectfully and earnestly the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The very purpose of this conference is to call the attention of the world to the fact that the dependent child has been neglected. We have legislated and we have provided and improvised for the delinquent child, and for all other classes of work. And yet he gets up on this floor and tells us we have all these organizations for caring for these other classes of children, and that therefore there is no reason for any organization especially devoted to advancing the interests of the poor little boy who is classed as a dependent child.

I protest as a boy who was dependent, and a boy who has always been very grateful for the opportunities that were given to him by good people during his dependency.

In keeping with the advancement of this age, there is necessity not only for the dissemination of knowledge, which would be the proper function of the children's bureau, but for, in some cases, an active propaganda. The very agency which is responsible for the public sentiment in favor of this children's bureau would be punishable by law, if it was an agency of the Government, for carrying on the active propaganda it has carried on in producing that sentiment.

It is not the function of a governmental body to do promotion work. Its function would be similar, and must be similar, to the Bureau of Education, which can simply record statistics and give out information which will be of value, but does not have the privilege of advocating an opinion in a way which is needed at this time with reference to this very important phase of children's work.

I heartily agree with Miss Wald, and all of the other good people who have been working for the children's bureau, and I was glad that this conference had the opportunity of indorsing the movement, and I will want to work for it. I think, however, that they are making a grave mistake if they advocate as a reason for the children's bureau, a scope large enough to do the things which some of us want done, if this proposition should be indorsed. In advocating this they are going to make opposition to their proposition, and in doing so they are going to jeopardize the safety of that bill in Congress to-day. So I most earnestly plead with you that it is to be remembered that there is a clear distinction between what can be done by a bureau which is part of the United States Government and an organization which is supported by private funds and by private charity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes Dr. Devine, of "Charities." [Laughter and applause.]

REMARKS OF DR. EDWARD T. DEVINE, EDITOR, "CHARITIES AND THE COMMONS," NEW YORK CITY.

Dr. DEVINE. As I listened to Mr. Birtwell's opening argument I felt like disagreeing with him, both in his argument and in his conclusions. As I understood the argument, it ran that the committee or association would not do very much good, and that there were a great many objections to it, but that, nevertheless, he was in favor of it. I felt a little like saying to myself that although I think it will do a great deal of good, instead of a little good, and although I think the objections to it are not anything like so strong as Mr. Birtwell painted them, nevertheless I am rather against it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BIRTWELL. It is rather a stand-off between us up to date. [Laughter.]

Dr. DEVINE. But as I thought the matter over more fully I realized that my personal feeling came simply out of the weariness of spirit to which Miss Wald has referred, resulting from a situation which does impose upon a number of people the responsibility of working in altogether too many different things, and I realize that here perhaps is a distinct piece of work which should be done which is not now being done, and which might well, after all, call into service a number of people who are not necessarily overburdened with other responsibilities of a similar kind.

A speaker has put the kind inquiry as to what the country would do without a publication which has been connected with my name when the chairman recognized me. And the inquiry has been suggested to my mind what the editors of the magazine would do if it were not for the national agencies which do precisely in their different fields the kind of work which it is proposed to have this committee do in this field. If that journal is useful it is very largely because the National Child Labor Committee, the National Tuberculosis Association, and various other national bodies and committees that I might name have been created to bring together information in their different fields, to correlate and study that information, and to put it readily at the disposition of those who need to have it at the particular time when they need to have it.

I do have a feeling that this field of dependent children, important as it is and well organized as it is in many respects, is not sufficiently well organized at the present time on a national basis. Of course this national committee should be representative, it should be as broadly representative as this conference, perhaps more broadly representative than this conference; it should be representative of all the agencies and activities that have to do in different ways with the welfare of dependent children. I do believe, after as careful consideration as I can give to it, that there should be such an association or committee in addition to the bureau, which, of course, I think we should also establish in the Federal Government. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF MR. LEE K. FRANKEL, RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION, NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. FRANKEL. One of the complaints that used to be made of a professor I had at college was the fact that he assumed that every pupil he had in his class knew as much about the subject as he did.

I think one of the great difficulties we run up against in a meeting of this kind is the assumption that the entire country is as thoroughly conversant with the care of children as we are. I know that to some of us, particularly those who come from New York, it seemed that yesterday we were discussing elementaries.

We have considered it as almost axiomatic that a normal child, if possible, should be kept with its parents and that the state supervision wherever required should be effected. At the same time the statement of the gentleman from Missouri yesterday, that his State had no supervision, came as a revelation to a few of us, and indicated that there are probably thousands throughout the country whose knowledge of either of these subjects is fragmentary and antiquated.

The question which comes in the discussion of this particular topic as to the need of such a new organization is:

Why has the subject of a natural organization not come up in other organizations? Those of us who have attended the National Conferences of Charities and Corrections know that for twenty-five years the subject of child care has been discussed.

Why has not the National Conference taken up the problem of organizing such a national movement? Why is it that there is a national society for the study of tuberculosis cases? Why have we a national child-labor organization? And why, if it is a question that has been discussed for many years, have we not evolved a national organization for child care?

I want to bring out one fact that ought to be recognized by this audience, and that is that the eradication of tuberculosis is to-day a universally accepted fact; the regulation of child labor within certain limits is likewise a universally recognized fact. For these reasons it was a perfectly feasible proposition for men and women interested in these topics to come together and to develop a national movement. I do not feel that after twenty-five years of discussion we have any universal acceptance as to methods of child care; and this has been most emphatically brought out in the discussions of the last two days. The question would arise, what shall such a national association do, along which lines shall its propaganda proceed? Shall it develop the idea of boarding out, of placing out, of home care? Shall it develop institutional treatment? I am very much afraid that, if for no other reason, from the purely practical reason of attempting to find some general plan along which to work this organization would go by the board and would fall to pieces.

For this reason, while I do not ordinarily favor such great conservatism, I believe that in this particular instance it would be well for us to make haste slowly, and that a national bureau as established by the Government—which after all is a cold and formal proposition—whose primary object is to collect facts, should be organized so that we may first of all determine what are the actual conditions existing in our child-caring institutions and in our home-finding agencies. When we are once able to definitely say that one or the other of these methods is the better, then probably we can proceed along more rational lines. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, I shall ask Mr. Birtwell to close the discussion in order that we may proceed to other topics, of which there are three, and for which only fifty minutes remain in which to discuss them.

ADDRESS OF MR. CHARLES W. BIRTWELL, GENERAL SECRETARY BOSTON CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.

Mr. BIRTWELL. As regards my opening argument, it is plainly evident that Mr. Devine was converted to the proposition by it. [Laughter.]

Now, let me say that I believe that the almost universal experience of people conducting movements, or promoting them outside of the Government, is that they long for some embodied governmental agency that is responsive to their cause. Such a committee as is proposed will need the Children's Bureau, so that when it gets a subject along to a certain point where there is unanimity and the taxpayers' money can be used there shall be a governmental body that has been watching and is able to say, "Now is the time for us to take over that work."

Now, the converse of the proposition is just as true, that every governmental body that has a really noble purpose—and that is what our governmental bodies are growing more and more to have—wants outside of itself a group of people who can interpret their motives to the people and help to make the people friendly to the accomplishment of their purposes. So the Children's Bureau, Miss Wald, needs the outside group and the outside group needs the Children's Bureau.

In answer to the argument of Mr. Frankel I want to say that what he said seems to me to be an argument for this committee. We want that process of multiplication to cease, and the new subjects as they come along to find a natural resting place in an existing organization of representative people. We want such a committee also for the further and extremely vital purpose that the people who are trying to serve unfortunate children in different lines may learn to conduct inquiries and experiments in all humility and with good will to each other by serving shoulder to shoulder in connection with causes where these differences do not figure. Some strategic lines of interest and work would surely be taken up where Mr. Robinson, for instance, who stands at the head of the largest children's institution in the country, and myself could stand side by side, not as differing on the question of institutions or families, but as agreeing on some subject not affected by that controversy. It would help toward final agreement concerning methods in regard to which we now differ if we could be marshaled behind an occasional flag that does not fly the insignia of difference. Give us something to do together, and let us not all the time be discussing our differences. So we shall promote good feeling and comradeship even in our differences. [Applause.]

Mrs. GLENN. I shall ask the privilege of but a word. Doctor Frankel spoke of the unanimity of action in connection with the Tuberculosis Association. I think those of us who attended the national meeting in the fall were tremendously interested in the very active discussion participated in by the German and French as to bovine tuberculosis. There was a very grave disagreement as to the effect of different forms of inoculation. I think we feel here that there may be differences among some of the experts as to the particular way in which to reach the dependent child, but we certainly can get together, and I think the difference that Doctor Frankel had drawn our attention to should strengthen us. [Applause.]

DISCUSSION ON TOPIC No. 1.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection we will now proceed to the discussion of topic No. 1, the question of the federal children's bureau. The formal discussion of that subject will occur this evening, but it was felt that there should certainly be opportunity for the freest possible interchange of opinion in the conference itself in its executive session.

Mr. Lovejoy, the Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, which is responsible for the presentation and introduction of the present measure, has been asked to be present and to speak very briefly at the outset in describing the provisions of the present bill and its purposes. I will ask Mr. Birtwell, if he will kindly do so, to take the chair. I would suggest that the discussion of this subject be limited at the most to twenty or twenty-five minutes, allowing a brief period for the other two subjects, before the hour of 4 o'clock.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. I will ask the secretary to read the topic that is now open for discussion.

The secretary read as follows:

Should there be established in one of the federal departments a national children's bureau, one of whose objects shall be the collection and dissemination of accurate information in regard to child-caring work and in regard to the needs of children throughout the United States?

ADDRESS OF OWEN R. LOVEJOY, GENERAL SECRETARY, NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE.

I may say in a few words what led the national child labor committee to desire the organization of such a bureau by the National Government. It seemed to this committee from its earliest history that very much of the time and strength expended by the committee could be done much better and much more appropriately by the Government than by any private organization. We believe there is a clear line of demarcation between public responsibility and the responsibility of private citizens. It may be our duty as private citizens to create public sentiment, to utilize the material, to popularize the views, but we do not believe it our duty to discover how many children in the United States are working in occupations that may be injurious to them, under what conditions they are working, or what effect it has on them. We believe it is the duty of the National Government to know that and to present those facts to individuals and organizations, and then let those individuals and organizations act on the information received.

I will not read the outline of the proposition, as I see you have copies of a summary of the bill in your hands. We desire that all organizations interested in the welfare of the child from whatever standpoint should cooperate in bringing before the proper committees in Congress the desirability of establishing such a bureau as is proposed, and we hope that the multitude of organizations represented here will cooperate with us. I think here is one proposition, appropriately numbered 1, on which the ideal outlined by Mr. Birtwell a moment ago can be realized, that we can find a kind of agreement here at least, and then perhaps with a very much better spirit and a larger cooperation discuss the specific details of these many problems with hope for ultimate solution.

The CHAIRMAN. The subject is now open for discussion. [After a pause.] Is there anyone in the audience who feels like uttering a word of caution against the adoption of article 1? It seems to be a large part of the function of the chairman, permanent and temporary, to try to extract from the audience objections. The chair will recognize Dr. Devine.

Dr. DEVINE. I would rather Doctor Lindsay would oppose this first.

Doctor LINDSAY. I did not rise to oppose it. If Dr. Devine wishes to oppose it, I would like to answer his argument. [Laughter.]

ADDRESS OF DR. EDWARD T. DEVINE, OF NEW YORK CITY.

Dr. DEVINE. I am not opposed to this measure, and I am in favor of it. I rise not to make any extensive address on either side, but to point out what it may be useful for members of the conference to have in mind as, in their several ways, they may seek to aid in securing this legislation; namely, what I understand to be the chief line of objection to it, and to seek if possible to help those who are here in the conference, in meeting that objection, because I do not myself believe it to be a valid one.

As I understand it, the chief objection that is made to the measure is that most of the things that are outlined in the bill are now being done or can be done by some other existing bureau of the Federal Government; that a number of things that are specified would seem logically to fall within other bureaus. The matter of child labor, for example, might very readily be said to fall within the proper scope of the Bureau of Labor; the subject of illiteracy might easily be held to fall within the scope of the Bureau of Education. I do not know that illiteracy is mentioned here, but I know it has been mentioned as one of the things that the bureau might properly investigate. The matter of the birth rate might conceivably be thought to fall within the scope of the Bureau of Vital Statistics, and so on.

The answer that has presented itself to my mind to this objection is that however true it may be that logically some of these things would seem to fall within the scope of other bureaus, that they are not, as a matter of fact, now attended to by these other bureaus, and that the funds appropriated by Congress to the other bureaus do not permit such an extension as would enable them to be attended to, even if the official heads of those bureaus and of the departments within which the bureaus are located would be in sympathy with such extension of their work. Moreover, it is exceedingly desirable that there should be united and correlated in some one bureau all of the different kinds of information, even though it might be conceivably collected by other bureaus, such as the Census Bureau, the Bureau of Vital Statistics, the Bureau of Education, the Bureau of Labor, the Bureau of Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, and so on—all of that information which does relate to the welfare of the child and the improvement of the human stock. Of course, it is not contemplated that this bureau should have administrative functions. This bureau, under our Constitution and Government, must be purely a bureau of research and publicity. That should be clearly recognized by all of those who advocate it.

If there is any other valid objection to this bill, any other even plausible objection to the bill, than that which I have indicated, it has not come to my attention. If there is any other argument that those present have thought of or have heard others express, I think it would be exceedingly helpful if it should be made known.

The CHAIRMAN. I think Miss Wald should congratulate herself that this question has already reached the stage of study of possible hindrances, with the view of getting this bill through; that we seem to have passed the stage of consideration as to whether we should adopt the suggestion, and that we are now studying the obstacles that we are going to meet. The chair will recognize Mr. Lindsay.

ADDRESS OF DR. SAMUEL McCUNE LINDSAY, PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL LEGISLATION IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Prof. LINDSAY. I would rather give time and consideration to the objections that may be urged, if there are any. I wish that the unanimity of opinion that seems to be indicated in favor of the bill could be relied upon to be found in Congress. I do think it might be well to give a notice here, if it has not already been given out, that to-morrow morning at half-past 10 o'clock, before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, in room 296 of the House business office building, there will be a hearing on this bill. I am very sure that if those of you who can stay over for that hearing, and who are interested in the bill, will do so, you will very materially aid the cause in getting favorable attention for this bill.

There is one thing to which I would like to call your attention as a special reason why we need such a bureau. In our country, where we have so many different legislative bodies—55 in all, I believe—legislating on these subjects indicated in the scope of this bureau, we are more in need of some central bureau of information than perhaps in any other country in the world, and we have less of it than in any other country in the world. I know from experience in our National Child Labor Committee how difficult it is to get at the information that already exists there—that is, for a private society outside to get at that information—information that has been collected by different societies of the Government with reference to child labor. It was very difficult indeed to get at it and bring it together in such a way as to be useful when formulating the opinions and in carrying on the propaganda of the National Child Labor Committee.

The mere comparative study of legislation is one thing which such a bureau ought properly to do for us. The handbook on Child Labor Legislation that is now gotten out each year by the National Consumers' League and has been published by the National Child Labor Committee, is a work that ought never to have been put upon a private society to do. It is a proper feature of work for the Government to do and is information that the Government ought to furnish on demand.

I presume all of you have had experience in dealing with foreign congresses and meetings in foreign countries, where information has been asked for relating to similar work in this country. You may have been able to send a reply indicating what was done in the State of New York, or in the State of Ohio, or in Illinois, or in some other

State—perhaps in two or three States—but rarely is it possible for the individual to give the necessary information relating to the whole country, and rarely has it been possible to get that information on short notice from the Central Government. I believe that our work would gain immeasurably in all of the various lines indicated in the scope of this bureau if we had some central body that was responsible for information and for research in these particular fields, some one to whom we could go with some reasonable assurance that our request would meet with immediate response, and that if the information was not on hand that all of the information now gathered by other bureaus and other agencies of the Government would be brought together.

There is no desire on the part of anybody, or on the part of anyone I know who has been interested in this work, to duplicate any work the Government is now doing; but there is a great deal of work the Government is now doing that could be done more effectively for the ends we have in view, if particular inquiries were suggested by some one who had these interests particularly in mind. For instance, such a child bureau could formulate inquiries which the Census would carry out on its regular schedule, and could formulate schedules for information that other departments of our Government could obtain. And by bringing this information together and circulating it in the West it would be useful to us all and add a great deal to the effectiveness of our work. [Applause.]

DISCUSSION ON TOPIC No. 12.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Are there further remarks to be made? If not, I shall, under the instructions of the chairman, proceed to the next question, topic No. 13. Will the secretary please read it?

The secretary read as follows:

Should there be close cooperation between all child-caring agencies in each community, in order to promote harmony of action in regard to the admission of children, the relations of child-caring agencies to the parents or surviving parent of children admitted to their care, and the subsequent supervision of children leaving their care?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. I am informed that no particular person has been asked to open the discussion of this question. Therefore it is now before you.

Calls were made for Mr. Stone.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stone is called for.

REMARKS OF SEYMOUR H. STONE, GENERAL SECRETARY, BOSTON CHILDREN'S FRIEND SOCIETY, SECRETARY, MASSACHUSETTS STATE CONFERENCE OF CHARITIES.

Mr. STONE. I want to speak particularly of the matter of cooperation among agencies, and especially among children's agencies in which I am more directly interested. In Boston there are three children's societies that work very closely together by using a central bureau of registration. When a case comes to the attention of one agency, enough facts to identify that case are sent to the central bureau of registration, generally over the telephone, if possible, while the applicant is in the office. I might say in connection with this that in addition to these three children's societies there are about sixty other charitable agencies of different kinds that register with this central bureau. The information that is sent in is compared with that furnished by the records in this central bureau, and

if it is found that there are any other organizations that have dealt with a particular case, inquiring organization is so notified. This inquiring organization often finds that as many as half a dozen different relief agencies all know about a particular case, and that the best thing to do is to immediately get in touch with these other relief agencies, either by sending an agent or by the use of the telephone, thereby profiting by the information already accumulated in treating with the case.

The three children's organizations that are working along similar lines have an understanding that if a case that has previously come to the attention of one of them applies to one of the others, it shall be immediately referred back to the first agency that has accumulated the information, and therefore undoubtedly investigated the condition of the case. By this method we save ourselves a great deal of work. It prevents duplication of effort and saves the applicant unnecessary investigation. I remember not very long ago that the Children's Friend Society, which I represent, was asked to take a baby from a mother who was living out at service. We labored with the person who made the application—it was not the mother, but the employer of the mother—but we could not make him look at it from our point of view.

Instead of heeding our advice, he went to first one and then to another, finally, I think, to four different agencies. We arranged to have this man meet the executive officers of those four different societies together, so that the matter might be thrashed out and the man persuaded, if possible, to take a wise course. Whether it resulted in good or not I do not know at this time, as this little conference took place very recently. I cite this simply to show the method of cooperation by which these four organizations were willing to pull together in a common cause.

By this method of registering the different agencies have the benefit of the investigations that have already been made, and in this way we all receive valuable help and suggestion from one another. Finally, we hope, and in a great many cases we already know, that the united forces of the different organizations are making a far better solution of the problem before us. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF JAMES F. JACKSON, SUPERINTENDENT ASSOCIATED CHARITIES, CLEVELAND.

Mr. JACKSON. I am exceedingly interested in the last gentleman's testimony, because my experience, or my observation at least, has not shown that the representatives of the various child-caring organizations were the most anxious of all charity people to work together. If the children's societies can actually and genuinely cooperate in a way that shall be helpful to one another, why in Heaven's name can not the rest of us do the same. I know of no way in which they can render more valuable assistance to the other charitable agencies of the United States than by putting into effect cooperation in various cities, like the scheme which has just been outlined from Boston. If the children, who are always scrapping, can get together, I am sure it will be a most wholesome example for the rest of the people.

If you ask a man if his organization cooperates with other organizations, of course he will say "yes." As a matter of fact cooperation is almost always construed to mean that you will speak as you pass

by [laughter], ask one another to each other's annual meetings, and in a particular instance on special request you will talk about a particular problem.

Now, cooperation that is not regular and automatic, that does not reach every particular problem, is not effective and never will be. Of course if it is mechanical that means that there must at the base be a genuine desire for a mutual usefulness, which insures the adjustment of inevitable differences as well as the exchange of facts. No cooperation that is not in part mechanical will ever be effective. I hope that this matter of cooperation will be pushed everywhere. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF MR. PARKER B. FIELD, SUPERINTENDENT CHILDREN'S MISSION TO THE CHILDREN OF THE DESTITUTE IN THE CITY OF BOSTON.

Mr. FIELD. If Boston has not already said too much, I would like to add a word or two in reference to this cooperation between our child-helping societies. The three societies which Mr. Stone has mentioned, and also the Worcester Children's Friends Society, got together I think nearly three years ago and held several meetings, in order to decide what points should be ascertained and recorded in relation to every child. These points were all gathered together and arranged in a certain order and then it was left to one of the societies to plan a form of registration card, to be arranged in such a way that no person could fill out this card fully without covering all these points which the societies had decided upon. That card was then printed in such a quantity that these four societies were supplied, also another child-helping agency in the State of Massachusetts.

The card has been adopted now by the State Board of Charity, as well as these five societies, and has become the standard card for the State. Besides this, if one of us prepares a circular or other printed matter which appears to fill a need he usually sends it to the others.

There is no jealousy or rivalry in these societies. They all are working together. I also ought to say that these child-helping societies should not take upon themselves the credit of this central registration. It was started by the Associated Charities in Boston in the first place. They suggested it to us and we were very glad to adopt it. The registration bureau is in the office of the Associated Charities, and very many other societies cooperate with these child-helping societies just as carefully and as closely as they cooperate with each other.

REMARKS OF MRS. KATE WALLER BARRETT, GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT NATIONAL FLORENCE CRITTENTON MISSION.

Mrs. BARRETT. Should we not also consider in the matter of cooperation between child-saving societies, the cooperating with other societies as well as with the child-saving societies. I speak especially in regard to the demand made upon the child-saving societies by caring for illegitimate children. The question has been alluded to several times here. Yesterday afternoon we heard from one of our large child-saving societies upon this subject and were informed of the large number of illegitimate children that are brought to them to be taken away from their mothers.

I think in regard to this class of children that every child-saving institution should put itself in touch with some organization that

will help unfortunate girls, and if these two societies could cooperate—the child-saving society and a wise society for helping and caring for the mothers—I believe a good many children could be kept in good homes with their mothers. I could not help but think yesterday, as I listened to Judge Mack's noble expression in regard to the large number of worthy mothers of illegitimate children he had to deal with in Chicago. How I thanked him for that brave expression of opinion and how I thanked the conference, too, for the hearty unanimity with which they greeted the expression.

I want to say to these child-saving societies represented here, as I have said to the child-saving societies in the District of Columbia, that often they can deal effectively with an illegitimate child, keeping it in a good Christian home, under moral influence, through helping the mother. When you help the mother you help the child, so it does seem that a most necessary obligation rests upon you to put yourselves in touch with wise and experienced persons in dealing with the mother, in order that they may help and advise you who have never studied the problem of the mother and who have been leaving the mother to take care of herself, how best to deal with both mother and child.

So I beg not only for cooperation which we should have with the child-saving institutions (working hand in hand), but also with the other institutions that can help in a marvelous way the child-saving institutions, by assisting to redeem the father and mother of the child, who will not only leave a black spot on the community, but often contaminate other people's children unless they are also benefited.

REMARKS OF MR. SUMNER W. HAYNES, SUPERINTENDENT INDIANA CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

MR. HAYNES. I have had the pleasure of visiting Boston with the idea of studying this particular feature, and I call their central bureau a clearing house. I think the business man will understand what I mean by that expression. The lady in charge waved her hand over a large table of cards and cases and said:

We have 90,000 cases right here which we have gathered from all of the charitable organizations of the city. I can pick out any case in five minutes and tell you the history of it. Any organization can telephone in here or call or send a messenger and we will look up the history of that case, and he can carry it away and record it in his own society.

I call it a clearing house, where everybody that is interested can get what he wants.

ADDRESS OF HENRY W. THURSTON, CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER, JUVENILE COURT, CHICAGO.

MR. THURSTON. Before we pass from this topic I would like to call attention to one other field in which there can be very effective cooperation in the care of children. In the West the juvenile courts are sending dependent children, and delinquent children as well, to institutions and to associations, and then those children are returned to the homes from which they came. Within the field of the probation officer there needs to be worked out the spirit and the fact of legal and social cooperation. I simply refer to this as a very vital field in which the spirit of this cooperative work can be carried with very great success, in order that we may not leave it out of our thought.

REMARKS OF DAVID F. TILLEY, MEMBER STATE BOARD OF CHARITY OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. TILLEY. I do not desire to speak as a member of the state board, but as a member of a private charity. I think it is only fair to say to this audience before they leave the subject under consideration that the cooperation which has been described exists only between the non-Catholic societies of Boston, and that as yet the cooperation which some of us hope for and look forward to has not been reached. But it will come when the spirit of fair play pervades throughout all associations caring for children.

REMARKS OF WILLIAM B. STREETER, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY IN THE CAROLINAS.

Mr. STREETER. Simply speaking for the Southland, where I am working now, I will say that we conceive it to be our duty—that is, the duty of the Children's Home Society—to enter into cooperation with any agency that will assist us in saving a child. We try to find out what is necessary regarding that child and then apply to the agency that can best assist or relieve the necessity, the society itself assuming legal obligation only for those children that should come exactly under its control. Therefore we cooperate with the Florence Crittenton Home, with the Catholic organizations, with the Protestant organizations—in fact, with all.

REMARKS OF REV. C. C. STAHMANN, STATE SUPERINTENDENT, MISSOURI CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

Mr. STAHMANN. I am going to visit Boston next year to find out all about your work; but in regard to this one subject I do not think you can teach us anything in St. Louis. We have that cooperation, we have what we call the Provident Association, and the work is done there so fully that all the requirements are met. We work together the different child-saving organizations with the Provident Association and also the St. Vincent de Paul Society, so that we are a little ahead of Boston on that question.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Michigan. We have with us the superintendent of one of the greatest, I might say, child-saving institutions in the country. I would like to hear a few words from her, from Mrs. Lucy M. Sickels, of Michigan.

REMARKS OF MRS. LUCY M. SICKELS, SUPERINTENDENT STATE INDUSTRIAL HOME FOR GIRLS.

Mrs. SICKELS. I am sorry Mr. Montgomery has called upon me. I have been here learning. While I have been in the work almost eighteen years saving girls, I am still learning, and as yet have only learned the alphabet. I think I have learned more here than in any other conference meeting, although I have been attending them for seventeen years.

I would like to say that in our institution we cooperate with the child-saving agencies throughout the State. We have a system of our own and have had it for some time. A county agent is appointed in every county in the State by the governor and works for the state board of charities and correction. He looks after and cares for our children that are placed in homes. I had to smile this morning over

the suggestion of looking after the children once a year at least. Why, bless your heart, we have our reports coming in every three months from the people who have the children. We go out and visit them two and three times a year. We have the county agent visit them at least twice a year, and I have letters from them every two or three weeks, and sometimes two in a week; and we are not taking care enough of them then. We can not take too much care, we can not look after them too much. We must let those people know that we are right there on the spot; that if there is anything wrong that we are within telephone connection.

We work with the Florence Crittenton Mission, and I do not know what we should do if it was not for the mission. We have a great many girls come to us that I have to send to Detroit to the mission, and we work together with the child and the mother, keeping them together. When we had our great conference in Portland, I went to visit a girl who was taken from our school to the Florence Crittenton Mission. Her baby was cared for there. We clothed her and clothed the baby, and kept them together until we found, a year or two afterwards, an aunt in the West who would take the child and mother. The child afterwards died. When I was there attending that conference I visited the girl, who was then a teacher in the State Normal School of Washington.

I could cite hundreds of cases of girls placed out who are holding fine positions and are mothers of families. It is cooperation we need, and I will be so glad to see and know that we have an efficient committee at Washington to whom we can write and get information, and I only hope that we will decide right here that we will have such a bureau.

It has been my experience that most of our neglected and delinquent children come from homes broken by divorce. There is no way now of getting at facts, except to write each institution, and these do not all keep data. If divorce is the cause, let us get at it; let us know, and then be able to better conditions by better laws, or a national marriage and divorce law.

I only hope we shall decide right here to have such a bureau for information. We need it. [Applause.]

Mr. DEVINE, of New York. To guard against the possibility that we may be using the word "cooperation" in two senses, I would like to ask Mr. Stahmann in regard to the St. Louis association. I know of the Provident Association very well, and have a high regard for it, and know about the very satisfactory cooperative arrangements existing in St. Louis.

Do I understand Mr. Stahmann to mean that there actually is a registration in the office of the Provident Association of all applications made to the home society and to the St. Vincent de Paul Society and to the child-saving institutions of all kinds in the city? If so, it has gone much farther in the way of common registration than I supposed.

Mr. STAHMANN. No, sir; we have not got to that yet. But in any case of need, in any case where a woman desires to give up a child, or a person desires aid or desires to board a child, all that information can be gotten there whether they have been there before or been to the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

In this way we can find out most anything we are anxious to find out about. If they do not have that information, they send after

it. They have visiting nurses, friendly visitors, and all that. In this way they are doing great service for us.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Birtwell). I wish there were time to ask Mr. Stone and Mr. Field to take up the further discussion of the matter suggested by Mr. Tilley's statement, but there really is not, and therefore perhaps I ought to let it pass, saying that his brief remarks raise a very intimate and not by any means simple problem in connection with cooperation. And I know Mr. Field and Mr. Stone would want me to say that these other organizations—perhaps I ought to speak only for the Children's Aid Society, and say that the Children's Aid Society is a nonsectarian organization. It is as truly "non-Protestant" as "non-Catholic." It includes on its board of directors Protestant, Catholic, and Jew; it includes in its paid office force Catholic and Protestant, and has employed Jews; it includes in its volunteers, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. These organizations are nonsectarian. The difficulty of nonsectarian organizations entering unreserved, unqualified, into cooperative relations with sectarian organizations, on a sectarian basis, is of course a question that we might discuss at great length this afternoon if we had the time.

Now, with your permission, and in order that we may not disappoint the chairman in the progress we make, I will ask for the reading of topic No. 14.

The secretary read as follows:

Should there be the freest opportunity for the placing of children in families without regard to State lines, excepting such reasonable provision as will insure each State against an improper burden of public dependents? Is it desirable that legislation enabling state boards of charity to exercise supervision over the placing-out work of both domestic and foreign corporations be uniform.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Who will take the floor on this question. I think it is a burning one with some organizations.

REMARKS OF MR. A. W. CLARK, SUPERINTENDENT CHILD-SAVING INSTITUTE OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. CLARK. I want simply to state that from our experience in Nebraska it is my judgment of the situation that very few in the State would have objection to the New York Children's Aid Society bringing children into our State; very few of them would have objection to other societies in other States bringing in children. There are many more families wanting children than there are children to supply to such homes. Just before leaving I looked over our files and counted nine hundred and twenty recent applications for children. I would estimate that in all probability two-thirds of these applications, on careful investigation, would be turned down, and yet here are three hundred, at least, I believe, good families anxious for children now, and we are unable to supply them.

I see no reason why restriction should be brought into this matter, as has been advocated by many.

REMARKS OF MR. B. PICKMAN MANN, PRESIDENT BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. MANN. There are some of our States that forbid the bringing into them of dependent children, but it has come to my notice that this may include children who belong to such organizations, for

instance, as the Board of Children's Guardians of the District of Columbia. There are at least two classes of these child-placing institutions. There are those who have no legal control of the children, who are given control which they could not support in a court, and who may take them to another State and leave them, and if the children are abandoned there is no one responsible, so that they are thrown upon the community.

But there is another class, to which the Board of Children's Guardians belongs, where the association is made the legal guardian of the children, and if they were taken to a State which forbids the importation of dependent children and such children were abandoned there, there is a legal guardian who could be held responsible, I think, for those children. It seems to me that in such legislation as forbids the introduction of dependent children, exceptions should be made of children who are the legal wards of some responsible body.

Mr. WILDER, of New York. I would like to hear from Mr. McKenna on that subject. He started yesterday, but did not get a good chance.

REMARKS OF DR. CHARLES F. McKENNA, OF NEW YORK CITY, SECRETARY, CATHOLIC HOME BUREAU, NEW YORK CITY.

Dr. McKENNA. I do not believe this is a subject that calls for much discussion any more than any of the others in which we find such unanimity, when it is carefully stated, as we find it here. The whole question is, shall restriction mean prohibition. I only ask that state boards of charity do not prohibit the placing of children in their States. It would be, as I said yesterday, ungenerous and not at all in accord with the spirit of our institutions. We certainly do practice free trade across the borders of our States, and if an accredited, responsible, respectable, thoughtful, conservative society engaged in placing-out work wishes to import into a State a normal, healthy, lovely child, full of promise of turning out to be a good citizen, the very best unit of asset, I do not see why any philanthropic or governmental agency should step forward and say "You can not cross our line."

It does seem as if there should be and can be no argument in the negative. I will ask the favor of being allowed to take the floor if any delegate has any real argument to present against this proposition.

REMARKS OF W. B. SHERRARD, SUPERINTENDENT NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY, SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

Mr. SHERRARD. As one living in the West, and one whose heart goes out to dependent children, no matter whether found in the wilds of Africa or in the prairies of Dakota, and as one who has brought children by the hundred into western States and placed them in homes, I will say this, that we of the West have been forced to put up the bars to protect ourselves from the poor work of the East. Children have been sent in there without any supervision, no watching, no care, and they drifted into our reform schools. In one instance I know of five children of one family, all of them in the reform school. A few years ago I received a letter from an eastern society—I will not come any closer than that lest I might cause a little irritation—saying that one of their wards had moved out to

South Dakota, and asking me if I would investigate the home, that there was some changed condition and they wanted me to make an investigation. I made the investigation. It took me three days to reach that case, a day and a half to go and a day and a half to return. When I sent in a bill for railroad and hotel fare—not for services, because I never charge anything for that, no matter what I do—that bill was rejected.

Now, you eastern people must not expect to use the West as a dumping ground on any proposition like that. [Laughter.] It is reciprocity and fair play for which we ask. You are responsible for the fact that in the Western States at the present time there is practically prohibitory legislation against their coming in.

For one, if I could rely upon your good behavior I would be glad to go to the legislature and ask them to wipe from the statute books the law that I put on there, but until you give me more evidence than you have in the past of your high integrity I can not do it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mrs. FALCONER, of Philadelphia. I would like to ask Mr. Butler, of Indiana, as to why Indiana has passed the law it has, and why they feel about it as they do in Indiana. I know our child-placing institution used to have a way of getting around it—I will not tell it here—but they have stringent laws, and I would like to hear from Mr. Butler on the subject.

REMARKS OF MR. AMOS W. BUTLER, SECRETARY BOARD OF STATE CHARITIES OF INDIANA.

Mr. BUTLER. I had not expected to speak on this subject; I said my piece yesterday.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. This is an encore.

Mr. BUTLER. Within the ten years ending with 1900 about 3,000 children were imported into Indiana from other States, an average of three hundred a year. A number of those became public dependents. Some were in the girls' school, some in the boys' school, some in hospitals for the insane, some in the school for the feeble-minded, and others in orphans' homes. One case that came to my attention was that of a person who had been in a hospital for the insane for twenty-five years as a public charge. He was sent to Indiana by a child-caring agency in another State. There was much complaint of this method of disposing of undesirable children, the attention of the legislature was brought to the subject, and it enacted a law regulating the importation of dependent children. The regulation has proven very satisfactory.

Our good friends of the Catholic Home Bureau of New York recently applied for permission to engage in the work in Indiana. Their application has been approved. They have filed a bond that no child placed in the State shall become a public ward, and they have been permitted to place children in the State.

Since I came here another agency has made verbal application for permission to do the same thing. All we ask is that the comity between States shall be the same as we recognize between counties, namely, that the place in which the individual has a local settlement shall be responsible for the care of the person in case he becomes a public charge; and if it does not do so that the bond shall be sufficient to cover the expense the State is put to in caring for that individual. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF VERY REV. JOSEPH RUESING, DEAN AND RECTOR OF ST. MARY'S CHURCH, WEST POINT, NEBR.

Father RUESING. I simply wish to state that we desire uniform legislation which will enable state boards of charities to exercise supervision over the placing-out work of both domestic and foreign societies. We have nearly one thousand children from the State of New York and other States in almost every county of the State of Nebraska, and there is absolutely no supervision or protection of these children. I am speaking from experience with the state board of charities, of which I have been a member for some years and which has had to deal with this question time and again.

From my experience, therefore, I do not hesitate to insist upon universal legislation in regard to the placing-out work of domestic as well as foreign societies. I emphasize the foreign society for the simple reason of the experience we have had in the State of Nebraska. For the last six years I have been associated in this work as a member of the state board of charities, and we have had much difficulty in taking care of these children brought in from the State of New York; and hence all I wanted to say was that I desire universal legislation.

A MEMBER. What was the number of years that they came in from the State of New York?

Father RUESING. About ten years.

REMARKS OF MR. MAX MITCHELL, SUPERINTENDENT FEDERATED JEWISH CHARITIES, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say one word and it is this: I am glad I came to the conference, and if we have done nothing else to-day, Mr. Chairman, but just to show a unanimous desire to have a national committee and a national bureau, I think we have done one of the most important things for the national welfare of this country. This last statement is an illustration of it. We are responsible for the growth of the children of this country, and if it is true that thousands of children are dumped into the West without the knowledge of what becomes of them, I think it is high time we have a national movement which should see that the children over the country are brought up as they ought to be, to make the right kind of men and women. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF REV. W. H. SLINGERLAND, SUPERINTENDENT IOWA CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY.

Mr. SLINGERLAND. I wish to say that what Mr. Sherrard has mentioned, and what the gentleman from Nebraska has emphasized, was true in regard to Iowa until a few years ago when we passed a law which was somewhat like the one mentioned in reference to Indiana. Since the matter has been thus referred to the board of control of state institutions and a bond necessarily required, we have been measurably free from the conditions that previously prevailed.

The same is true of Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. I mention this to show that these restrictions were put upon the statute books because of the intolerable conditions that prevailed in past years.

REMARKS OF MR. CHARLES LORING BRACE, SECRETARY NEW YORK CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.

Mr. BRACE. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I must say a word for New York in this matter. I heartily approve of the plan that there should be a similarity in the laws in all of the States, and that there should be bonds filed by societies in the States in which they operate. The Children's Aid Society of New York has bonds to the amount of \$25,000 on file in Western States. The bonds guarantee that we shall do our work exactly as we have done, if within my memory, and as we desire to do the work. We have bonds filed in Delaware, in Iowa, in Missouri, in Minnesota, and in Kansas. We hope that Nebraska will soon pass a law which will require that a bond shall be on file there also. Unfortunately certain persons in Nebraska have been rather prejudiced of late years and have attempted to pass a law which is prohibitive, not regulative. I think that the public opinion of the people of Nebraska is with us in this matter and that very soon guaranty bonds will be required that will insure that children shall be placed in that State with care.

The gentleman who has just spoken, Father Ruesing, has made an error in his figures. Two thousand children have not been sent out to Nebraska from New York during the year. It is impossible. The New York Children's Aid Society placed last year 60 children in Nebraska, in very good homes. We visit them regularly, and they are doing well. The New York Foundling Society placed, I am told by my friends of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, 450 children throughout the United States. I imagine that not many of them went to Nebraska. The Children's Aid Society, which cooperates with all Protestant institutions, is the only society sending children West among the Protestants. The Foundling Society is the only society sending children West as far as that among Catholics.

I call this matter to the attention of the gentleman who made this reference to New York, and I shall be glad if he will write to the office of the Children's Aid Society and obtain actual statements of fact, the addresses of the children, where they are, and how they are getting on. We shall be glad to supply him with the information. [Applause.]

In relation to the remarks made by Mr. Butler, of Indiana, the New York Children's Aid Society has not placed any children in homes in that State in the last twenty years, so that Mr. Butler's remarks can not refer to that society.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLKS). Under the rules of the conference I am compelled to close the discussion on this subject at this time.

You all remember the sign over the organ in a church out West, "Do not shoot the organist; he is doing as well as he can." In behalf of the committee on resolutions may I say in advance of its report that it sat to a very late hour last night and has been in continuous session since an early hour this morning and until this moment. It is doing as well as it can.

Mr. Hart, are you ready to report?

Mr. HART. The committee is ready to report.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you kindly present the report of the committee on resolutions?

Mr. HART. The committee on resolutions has labored under some difficulty, because of the fact that we could not all be in two places at once, and we have not been able, although we have tried, to hear as much of the discussion as we would like for our guidance in preparing this report. This has been because although some members have been present during all of the discussions it was necessary for the committee to have its report ready at this time.

I would say further, with reference to the resolutions submitted on the floor, the committee has embodied, we believe, in their report all that was desired in those resolutions with one single exception, and we found that would involve such a division as would endanger the unanimous adoption of the report. With that exception we think we have covered what was involved in the resolutions submitted to us.

We recommend that, in lieu of resolutions, the conference address the following letter to the President:

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES EMBODYING THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE ON THE CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,

President of the United States.

SIR: Having been invited by you to participate in a conference on the care of dependent children, held at Washington, D. C., January 25-26, 1909, and having considered at the sessions of such conference the various phases of the subject as stated in the memorandum accompanying your letter of invitation, and such others as have been brought before us by the executive committee, we desire to express the very great satisfaction felt by each member of this conference in the deep interest you have taken in the well-being of dependent children. The proper care of destitute children has indeed an important bearing upon the welfare of the nation. We now know so little about them as not even to know their number, but we know that there are in institutions about 93,000, and that many additional thousands are in foster or boarding homes. As a step, therefore, in the conservation of the productive capacity of the people and the preservation of high standards of citizenship, and also because each of these children is entitled to receive humane treatment, adequate care, and proper education, your action in calling this conference, and your participation in its opening and closing sessions, will have, we believe, a profound effect upon the well-being of many thousands of children and upon the nation as a whole.

Concerning the particular objects to which you called attention in the invitation to this conference, and the additional subjects brought before us by the executive committee, our conclusions are as follows:

HOME CARE.

1. Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. It is the great molding force of mind and of character. Children should not be deprived of it except for urgent and compelling reasons. Children of parents of worthy character, suffering from temporary misfortune, and children of reasonably efficient and deserving mothers

who are without the support of the normal breadwinner, should as a rule be kept with their parents, such aid being given as may be necessary to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children. This aid should be given by such methods and from such sources as may be determined by the general relief policy of each community, preferably in the form of private charity rather than of public relief. Except in unusual circumstances, the home should not be broken up for reasons of poverty, but only for considerations of inefficiency or immorality.

PREVENTIVE WORK.

2. The most important and valuable philanthropic work is not the curative, but the preventive; to check dependency by a thorough study of its causes and by effectively remedying or eradicating them should be the constant aim of society. Along these lines we urge upon all friends of children the promotion of effective measures, including legislation, to prevent blindness, to check tuberculosis and other diseases in dwellings and work places and injuries in hazardous occupations, to secure compensation or insurance so as to provide a family income in case of sickness, accident, death, or invalidism of the breadwinner; to promote child-labor reforms, and generally, to improve the conditions surrounding child life. To secure these ends we urge efficient cooperation with all other agencies for social betterment.

HOME FINDING.

3. As to the children who for sufficient reasons must be removed from their own homes, or who have no homes, it is desirable that, if normal in mind and body and not requiring special training, they should be cared for in families whenever practicable. The carefully selected foster home is for the normal child the best substitute for the natural home. Such homes should be selected by a most careful process of investigation, carried on by skilled agents through personal investigation and with due regard to the religious faith of the child. After children are placed in homes, adequate visitation, with careful consideration of the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual training and development of each child on the part of the responsible home-finding agency, is essential.

It is recognized that for many children foster homes without payment for board are not practicable immediately after the children become dependent, and that for children requiring temporary care only the free home is not available. For the temporary, or more or less permanent, care of such children different methods are in use, notably the plan of placing them in families, paying for their board, and the plan of institutional care. Contact with family life is preferable for these children, as well as for other normal children. It is necessary, however, that a large number of carefully selected boarding homes be found if these children are to be cared for in families. The extent to which such families can be found should be ascertained by careful inquiry and experiment in each locality. Unless and until such homes are found, the use of institutions is necessary.

COTTAGE SYSTEM.

4. So far as it may be found necessary temporarily or permanently to care for certain classes of children in institutions, these institutions should be conducted on the cottage plan, in order that routine and impersonal care may not unduly suppress individuality and initiative. The cottage unit should not be larger than will permit effective personal relations between the adult caretaker or caretakers of each cottage and each child therein. Twenty-five is suggested as a desirable cottage unit, subject to revision in the light of further experience in the management of cottage institutions. The cottage plan is probably somewhat more expensive, both in construction and in maintenance, than the congregate system. It is so, however, only because it secures for the children a larger degree of association with adults and a nearer approach to the conditions of family life, which are required for the proper molding of childhood. These results more than justify the increased outlay, and are truly economical. Child-caring agencies, whether supported by public or private funds, should by all legitimate means press for adequate financial support. Inferior methods should never be accepted by reason of lack of funds without continuing protest. Cheap care of children is ultimately enormously expensive, and is unworthy of a strong community. Existing congregate institutions should so classify their inmates and segregate them into groups as to secure as many of the benefits of the cottage system as possible, and should look forward to the adoption of the cottage type when new buildings are constructed.

The sending of children of any age or class to almshouses is an unqualified evil, and should be forbidden everywhere by law, with suitable penalty for its violation.

INCORPORATION.

5. To engage in the work of caring for needy children is to assume a most serious responsibility, and should, therefore, be permitted only to those who are definitely organized for the purpose, who are of suitable character, and possess, or have reasonable assurance of securing, the funds needed for their support. The only practicable plan of securing this end is to require the approval by a state board of charities or other body exercising similar powers, of the incorporation of all child-caring agencies, including the approval of any amendments of the charter of a benevolent corporation, if it is to include child-caring work; and by forbidding other than duly incorporated agencies to engage in the care of needy children.

STATE INSPECTION.

6. The proper training of destitute children being essential to the well-being of the State, it is a sound public policy that the State through its duly authorized representative should inspect the work of all agencies which care for dependent children, whether by institutional or by home-finding methods, and whether supported by public or private funds. Such inspection should be made by trained agents, should be thorough, and the results thereof should be reported to the responsible authorities of the institution or agency concerned. The information so secured should be confidential—not to be disclosed except by competent authority.

INSPECTION OF EDUCATIONAL WORK.

7. Destitute children at best labor under many disadvantages, and are deprived in greater or less degree of the assistance and guidance which parents afford their own children. It is important, therefore, that such children be given an education which will fit them for self-support and for the duties of citizenship, and the State should provide therefor. In order that this education may be equal to that afforded by the schools attended by the other children of the community, it is desirable that the education of children in orphan asylums and other similar institutions or placed in families should be under the supervision of the educational authorities of the State.

FACTS AND RECORDS.

8. The proper care of a child in the custody of a child-caring agency, as well as the wise decision as to the period of his retention and ultimate disposition to be made of him, involve a knowledge of the character and circumstances of his parents, or surviving parent, and near relatives, both before and at the time the child becomes dependent and subsequently. One unfortunate feature of child-caring work hitherto is the scanty information available as to the actual careers of children who have been reared under the care of charitable agencies. This applies both to institutions, which too frequently lose sight of the children soon after they leave their doors, and home-finding agencies, which too frequently have failed to exercise supervision adequate to enable them to judge of the real results of their work. It is extremely desirable that, taking all precautions to prevent injury or embarrassment to those who have been the subjects of charitable care, the agencies which have been responsible for the care of children should know to what station in life they attain, and what sort of citizens they become. Only in this manner can they form a correct judgment of the results of their efforts.

We believe, therefore, that every child-caring agency should—

(a) Secure full information concerning the character and circumstances of the parents and near relatives of each child in whose behalf application is made, through personal investigation by its own representative, unless adequate information is supplied by some other reliable agency.

(b) Inform itself by personal investigation at least once each year of the circumstances of the parents of children in its charge, unless the parents have been legally deprived of guardianship, and unless this information is supplied by some other responsible agency.

(c) Exercise supervision over children under their care until such children are legally adopted, are returned to their parents, attain their majority, or are clearly beyond the need of further supervision.

(d) Make a permanent record of all information thus secured.

PHYSICAL CARE.

9. The physical condition of children who become the subjects of charitable care has received inadequate consideration. Each child received into the care of such an agency should be carefully examined by a competent physician, especially for the purpose of ascertaining

whether such peculiarities, if any, as the child presents may be due to any defect of the sense organs, or to other physical defect. Both institutions and placing-out agencies should take every precaution to secure proper medical and surgical care of their children and should see that suitable instruction is given them in matters of health and hygiene.

COOPERATION.

10. Great benefit can be derived from a close cooperation between the various child-caring agencies, institutional and otherwise, in each locality. It is especially desirable that harmonious relations be established in regard to the classes of children to be received by each agency; the relations of such agencies to the parents of children received; and the subsequent oversight of children passing from the custody of child-caring agencies. The establishment of a joint bureau of investigation and information by all the child-caring agencies of each locality is highly commended, in the absence of any other suitable central agency through which they may all cooperate.

UNDESIRABLE LEGISLATION.

11. We greatly deprecate the tendency of legislation in some States to place unnecessary obstacles in the way of placing children in family homes in such States by agencies whose headquarters are elsewhere, in view of the fact that we favor the care of destitute children, normal in mind and body, in families, whenever practicable.

We recognize the right of each State to protect itself from vicious, diseased, or defective children from other States, by the enactment of reasonable protective legislation; but experience proves that the reception of healthy normal children is not only an act of philanthropy, but also secures a valuable increment to the population of the community and an ultimate increase of its wealth.

The people of the more prosperous and less congested districts owe a debt of hospitality to the older communities from which many of them came.

We earnestly protest, therefore, against such legislation as is prohibitive in form or in effect, and urge that where it exists, it be repealed.

PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.

12. The care of dependent children is a subject about which nearly every session of the legislature of every State in the Union concerns itself; it is a work in which state and local authorities in many States are engaged, and in which private agencies are active in every State; important decisions are being made constantly by associations, institutions, and public authorities, affecting questions of policy, the type of buildings to be constructed, the establishment of an adequate system of investigating homes and visiting children placed in homes, and scores of important matters affecting the well-being of needy children. Each of these decisions should be made with full knowledge of the experience of other States and agencies, and of the trend of opinion among those most actively engaged in the care of children, and able to speak from wide experience and careful observation. One effective means of securing this result would be the establish-

ment of a permanent organization to undertake, in this field, work comparable to that carried on by the National Playground Association, the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, the National Child Labor Committee, and other similar organizations in their respective fields. It is our judgment that the establishment of such a permanent voluntary organization, under auspices which would insure a careful consideration of all points of view, broad-mindedness and tolerance, would be desirable and helpful, if reasonably assured of adequate financial support.

FEDERAL CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

13. A bill is pending in Congress for the establishment of a federal children's bureau to collect and disseminate information affecting the welfare of children. In our judgment, the establishment of such a bureau is desirable, and we earnestly recommend the enactment of the pending measure.

SUMMARY.

14. The preceding suggestions may be almost completely summarized in this—that the particular condition and needs of each destitute child should be carefully studied and that he should receive that care and treatment which his individual needs require, and which should be as nearly as possible like the life of the other children of the community.

15. We respectfully recommend that you send to Congress a message urging favorable action upon the bill for a federal children's bureau and the enactment of such legislation as will bring the laws and the public administration of the District of Columbia and other federal territory into harmony with the principles and conclusions herein stated, and we further recommend that you cause to be transmitted to the governor of each State of the Union a copy of the proceedings of this conference for the information of the state board of charities or other body exercising similar powers.

By order of the conference:

Yours, very respectfully,

HASTINGS H. HART,
EDMOND J. BUTLER,
JULIAN W. MACK,
HOMER FOLKS,
JAMES E. WEST,
Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. HART. This concludes the report of the committee. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize Mr. Butler, of New York.

Mr. BUTLER, of New York. I move that the report of the committee be received and adopted as read.

Mr. KINGSLEY, of Chicago. I second the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is now before you.

Mr. CROUSE, of Cincinnati. I favor the report of the committee most heartily throughout, with the exception of one single word. In speaking of the frequent visitation of children placed out, it says that in some cases it would be greatly to the advantage of the child

in the family to be frequently visited. I suggest to the committee adequate visitations.

The CHAIRMAN (after the committee on resolutions had conferred). A meeting of the committee has been held and the suggestion made by Mr. Crouse has been accepted, with your kind permission.

Dr. W. P. SPRATLING, of Baltimore. Mr. Chairman, I want only to say one word, and that is the committee makes mention of the fact—and the preservation of the home seems to be the dominant note in this meeting—that in the cottage system the cost is greater than in the use of large buildings. It was my good fortune to be connected with probably the largest colony in the country, where we have at this time put up some eighty odd buildings, and the cost of construction was not any greater than the cost of building a single building. In fact, the cost of construction, including heating, lighting, and plumbing, was about \$425 a bed; and not only has the cost of construction been less but the cost of maintenance.

Mr. HART. The committee inserted the word "probably" for the reason we found there was a difference of opinion on that very point. The popular idea seems to be that the cost, at least of maintenance, was somewhat higher. We knew that there were some members of the conference who from their experience had a different view, and therefore we said "probably."

The CHAIRMAN. The precise phraseology was "probably somewhat higher."

Mr. DEVINE, of New York. I desire to say but a word in support of this motion, and to express the hope that the motion will be immediately and unanimously adopted. I would like to say—though perhaps it might be more proper for some one else to say it—that it is a remarkable document. The conference is to be congratulated upon the manner in which the committee has done its work. [Applause.] The report is plain spoken, and it ought to be. It takes advanced grounds, as the President expressed the hope it would. At the same time it expresses what I believe to be, if I can judge from the trend of the discussion, the unanimous feeling of the conference. Even if individual members might possibly desire that this or that phrase or this or that word should be expressed a little differently, it is obviously impossible for the conference to do over again the work of the committee, and I hope, therefore, that we shall unanimously adopt the report as it stands. [Applause.]

Mr. DYSART, of Milwaukee. I should say that this report is the last word up to this period of the twentieth century. I wish to ask if the committee has decided whether this report shall be published separately from the book of proceedings. I hope so, for I want to order hundreds of copies of the report, and I could not order that number of the book of proceedings, perhaps.

The CHAIRMAN. I will ask the secretary to make a statement in that regard.

The SECRETARY. By an arrangement with an enterprising printer in this city there will be thousands of copies of the report ready within a few hours after its adoption by the conference. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is before you. Is there anything further?

[Calls of "Question."]

Mr. WILLIAM B. BUCK, of Philadelphia. I would like to ask for the reading again of that clause of the report which deals with the desirable number of children in cottages. As I understand the reading it names 25 as the lowest number.

Mr. HART. It says 25 is suggested as a desirable cottage unit.

The CHAIRMAN. Subject to future revision, as a result of wider experience.

Mr. HART. The committee was divided on that question, but that was the consensus of opinion; the compromise upon which we agreed.

Mr. BUCK. It would not be possible to insert, "not to exceed 25!"

Mr. HART. No, sir.

[Calls of "Question."]

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further discussion I will put the question.

Mr. BIRTWELL, of Boston. I want to second the appeal for a unanimous vote. I am as sensitive to the phrases in that report, I believe, as anyone else in this room; but it is a simply magnificent report. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Before putting the question it would perhaps be proper for me to say that only those who were invited to the conference, those whose names appear in the list, are entitled to vote, although we are glad to have a certain number of visitors present.

Those in favor of the adoption of the report, making it the action of the conference, will please rise. [The members of the Conference rose.] Those opposed to the adoption of the report will please rise. [There was no manifestation of objection to the adoption of the report.] [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. Secretary, it appears to be unanimously adopted.

Mr. FOX, of New Jersey. I move a vote of thanks to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say I am sure in behalf of the committee, as one of its very humble members, that we are profoundly touched by the reception which this report has received from the members of this conference; and we trust that it may prove to be as acceptable to those who are not present, but are in other places throughout this country, as it is to those here represented.

Mr. FOX. I would like to ask what steps it is now proposed to take to put into effect the resolution with regard to the national society, the voluntary society?

The CHAIRMAN. That is up to the gentleman to whom our report will be submitted.

(Thereupon, at 4.55 o'clock p. m., a recess was taken until 7.30 o'clock this evening.)

**FINAL SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE AND SUBSCRIPTION DINNER, NEW
WILLARD HOTEL, TUESDAY EVENING, 7.30 O'CLOCK.**

BANQUET COMMITTEE.

| | |
|---|--|
| GEORGE S. WILSON, Chairman. | |
| JOHN B. SLEMAN, Jr., Treasurer. | |
| MR. ERNEST P. BICKNELL. | HON. CHARLES P. NEILL. |
| HON. HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND. | MR. JAMES E. WEST. |
| | |
| MR. OWEN R. LOVEJOY, New York City. | HON. JACOB M. MOSES, Baltimore. |
| HON. N. B. FEAGIN, Birmingham, Ala. | DR. CHAS. P. PUTNAM, Boston. |
| MR. A. J. MCKELWAY, Atlanta, Ga. | MR. JOHN B. MONTGOMERY, Coldwater, |
| MR. JULIUS ROSENWALD, Chicago. | Mich. |
| HON. ROBT. W. BINGHAM, Louisville, Ky. | MR. CHARLES D. HILLES, Dobbs Ferry, |
| MR. GEO. W. WILDER, New York City. | N. Y. |

PROGRAMME.

Presiding: Mr. Homer Folks, Vice-chairman of the Conference.

General subject: A Federal Children's Bureau.

Speakers: Miss Lillian D. Wald, Member National Child Labor Committee; Mr. Mornay Williams, President Children's Village, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.; Rev. Francis H. Gavisk, Member State Board of Charities of Indiana; Hon. James Rudolph Garfield, Secretary of the Interior.

"The Significance of the Conference"—Hon. Herman A. Metz, Comptroller, New York City; Hon. Ben. B. Lindsey, Judge of the Juvenile Court, Denver, Colo.; Hon. Julian W. Mack, formerly Judge of the Juvenile Court, Chicago, Ill.

Report of the conference submitted to the President and closing remarks by President Roosevelt.

The TOASTMASTER (Mr. Homer Folks). It is a great pleasure to be able to welcome so many of our friends, all friends of the children, to this, the final session of the White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children.

I hold in my hand a partial list of some of the bureaus of the Federal Government. I find on this list a Bureau of Corporations, although unfortunately not of benevolent corporations. I find a Bureau of Manufactures, a Bureau of Fisheries, a Bureau of Standards—but not of child-saving work; a Reclamation Service, but not for the reclamation of children. We wish to add another bureau, a bureau for the benefit of needy children. [Applause.]

You know, of course, that a bill has been introduced in both branches of the Congress. A copy of it will be placed in your hands before you leave this room. That bill, I am pleased to be able to tell you, has been indorsed this afternoon unanimously and strongly by this conference. [Applause.]

You have heard many times of the man behind the gun. I present to you the woman behind the bureau, Miss Wald.

ADDRESS OF MISS LILLIAN D. WALD, OF NEW YORK.

A PLEA FOR THE CREATION OF THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BY MISS LILLIAN D. WALD, NEW YORK, MEMBER OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE; HEADWORKER, HENRY STREET SETTLEMENT.

THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

Although the National Child Labor Committee stands sponsor for the bill introduced in Congress for the establishment in the Department of the Interior of a Children's Bureau, the committee can no longer claim sole guardianship of this measure, nor would it indeed desire to do so.

WHAT PUBLIC BODIES SUPPORT THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

Two and three days ago, 25,000 clergymen in these United States proclaimed once again from pulpits of all creeds the eternal message of the value of the child, outlined to their hearers the modern conception of childhood's claim upon society and the obligations to the child of a society which has prospered by all the results of a progressive civilization. They asked their congregations, whether Jew or Gentile, to consider and support this effort to bring the child into his heritage of this civilization. And not only have the 25,000 clergymen and their congregations shown their desire to participate in furthering this bill, but organizations of many diverse kinds have assumed a degree of sponsorship that indicates indisputably how universal has been its call to enlightened mind and heart. The national organizations of women's clubs, the consumers' leagues throughout the country, college and school alumnae associations, societies for the promotion of special interests of children, the various state child labor committees, representing in their membership and executive committees education, labor, law, medicine, and business, have officially given indorsement.

THE PRESS.

The press, in literally every section of the country, has given the measure serious editorial discussion and approval.

Not one dissenting voice has it been possible to discover—not one utterance contradicts the principles that have been laid down by these various representatives of humanitarian thought and unselfish patriotism throughout America and which they believe the bill will advance as that within its scope of potentialities for such broadening.

THE IDEA EMBODIED IN THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

It may be, at first, something of a shock to hear of taking the child out of the realm of poetry and pure sentiment into the field of scientific organized care and protection, but only to the superficially sentimental could it appear that the poetry and purity of childhood might be sacrificed by using all the fruits of modern thought, study, experience and knowledge to their advantage—"Even the least of these."

WHAT WOULD THE BUREAU DO?

What would the bureau do? What measures for the advantage of the child, the future citizen, and the country would the bureau further? What innovations in governmental functions would the bureau introduce? These are pertinent questions that may well be asked, and which must be answered to the satisfaction of the men in both Houses of Congress before we shall have the right to ask them to vote for its creation. The bureau would be a clearing-house, a source of information and reliable education on all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially it would investigate and report upon the questions now nowhere answered in complete or unified form, and whose enormous importance to national life is so strikingly evident. Orphanage has many aspects that should call out the wisdom of the sages. Perhaps not enough has been done. Perhaps, in some respects, too much. The orphan is a child and yet orphanage means to some people, even now, the commitment to an asylum. Many are like the pious philanthropist who prayed, "Oh, Lord, send us many orphans that we may build the new wing to the asylum."

It would fix upon the Government the responsibility; the attitude now is not unlike the small boy's of whom my friend in New York speaks. He had told him of the story of Nero. The brutality of the monster was vividly related; how he slew his mother; how he played while Rome burned, etc. The boy showed no concern, and to draw him out my friend said, "Well, what do you think of that kind of a man?" "He never done nothin' to me," quoth the boy with a shrug.

It would investigate legislation affecting children in the several States and Territories, and all other facts that have a bearing upon the health, the efficiency, the character, the happiness, and the training of children. Nothing would it do to duplicate any work now being done by State or Federal Government, but it would strengthen their work and bring into immediate usefulness all of the statistical facts that may lie in the treasure-house of any governmental department or any private association. Practical cooperation of this kind, based on intelligent sympathy, has already been assured by the far-seeing Chief of the Educational Bureau and by the head of the Census Bureau. As much of the results of their researches as would enrich the Children's Bureau would be laid before it almost without the asking, and yet, important as is their information and their knowledge, it covers only a part of what pertains to the whole great question of the wisest and most enlightened guardianship of our children, the most valuable natural asset of our nation. Literally the Education Bureau is all that we have done that could be directly construed for the children from which it might be said that we as a nation are indifferent.

The Children's Bureau would not merely collect and classify information, but it would be prepared to furnish to every community in the land information that was needed, diffuse knowledge that had come through experts' study of facts valuable to the child and to the community. Many extraordinary valuable methods have originated in America and have been seized by communities other than our own as valuable social discoveries. Other communities have

had more or less haphazard legislation and there is abundant evidence of the desire to have judicial construction to harmonize and comprehend them. As matters now are within the United States, many communities are retarded or hampered by the lack of just such information and knowledge, which, if the bureau existed, could be readily available. Some communities within the United States have been placed in most advantageous positions as regards their children, because of the accident of the presence of public-spirited individuals in their midst who have grasped the meaning of the nation's true relation to the children, and have been responsible for the creation of a public sentiment which makes high demands. But nowhere in the country does the Government, as such, provide information concerning vitally necessary measures for the children. Evils that are unknown or underestimated have the best chance for undisturbed existence and extension, and where light is most needed there is still darkness. Ours is, for instance, the only great nation which does not know how many children are born and how many die in each year within its borders; still less do we know how many die in infancy of preventable diseases; how many blind children might have seen the light, for one-fourth of the totally blind need not have been so had the science that has proved this been made known in even the remotest sections of the country.

Registration and our statistics on these matters are but partial, and their usefulness is minimized by the unavoidable passage of time before their appearance. There could be no greater aid to the reduction of infant mortality than full and current vital statistics of children, such as no one community can obtain for itself, and for want of which young lives, born to be valuable to society, are wasted. We realize only occasionally, or after the occurrence of some tragedy, how little is known of other important incidents of the children's lives. We can not say how many are in the jails or almshouses, though periodically the country is stirred by some newspaper report, such as that one of a little boy of twelve sentenced to five years in a federal penitentiary, or that of a little boy confined for some months upon a trivial charge and incarcerated with a murderer, and other evil men and women, in the cell of a county jail. Outside the few States which have juvenile courts there is chaos in the treatment and punishment of difficult children, and largely because of lack of knowledge concerning this important matter. This information can not be effectively obtained by private agencies. It is too vital to be left to that chance. Only the Federal Government can cover the whole field and tell us of the children with as much care as it tells of the trees or the fishes or the cotton crop.

I remember that some three years ago when it was our pleasure to bring this suggestion before the President, his first expression of approval was, if I recall rightly, that "It was bully." It was a coincidence that the Secretary of Agriculture was departing that same morning to the South to find out what danger to the community lurked in the appearance of the boll weevil. That brought home, with a very strong emphasis to the appeal, the fact that nothing that could have happened to the children would have called forth such official action on the part of the Government.

What measures for the advantage of the child and the country would the bureau further? No direct responsibility or administra-

tive function for furthering new measures would fall upon the experts of a children's bureau, but proceeding by the experience of other scientific bodies there would be ample justification for employing the best minds of the country for the application of the knowledge gained, by using the stimulus of suggestion and education. It takes no stretch of the imagination to believe that, with the light of knowledge turned by responsible experts upon all phases of the problem of the child, the American people could be trusted, if not with the immediate solution, then with serious consideration, for what appears to be a national apathy is not really so in fact. This conference would disprove that. What innovation in the governmental function would this introduce? This measure for the creation of a children's bureau can claim no startling originality. It would introduce no innovation, no new principle, in the functions of government. It is along the line of what we have been doing for many years to promote knowledge on other interests. On material matters look carefully into the history of the development and present scope of the various bureaus within the authority of the Government, and ample and fascinating analogies will be found.

Other countries, too, have awakened to realize the import of efficient guardianship of their children, have gathered expert information and are using it under the leadership of trained specialists. The French call the development of this "child culture," which implies the use of scientific minds and trained powers, coordinated functions, and the protection of the State to the end of efficient manhood through a well-guarded childhood. Current literature every day shows the trend of civilized people to fix the responsibility upon the present generation to persevere and cultivate its resources, indeed, charging as a crime against us any reckless waste of these. The English children's bill, if that within a day or two has become "An act," is a best example of this as regards the children. That bill is a most remarkable document indeed, covering practically every incident in the child's life that might come within the concern of the Government. Its ninety folio pages constitute a complete code, and reflect not only the wide range of the Government's information, but cover every interesting phase of the development of this vital social and economic matter. A "veritable children's charter" it has been called. The forms of the English Government and ours differ. We do not desire the code; details and administration can be left to the States; but we do desire, and we most urgently need, information and the best means of broad publicity on all matters relating to the children, that the national intelligence and conscience may be stirred. The full responsibility for the wise guardianship of these children lies upon us. We cherish belief in the children, and hope, through them, for the future. But no longer can a civilized people be satisfied with the casual administration of that trust. Is not the importance of these a call for the best statesmanship our country can produce? I ask you to consider whether this call for the children's interests does not imply the call for our country's interests? Can we afford to take it? Can we afford *not* to take it? For humanity, for social well-being, for the security of the Republic's future, let us bring the child into the sphere of our national care and solicitude.

The TOASTMASTER. Although a lawyer, never doubted; although from New York, not a politician; citizen, patriot, philanthropist—Mornay Williams. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. MORNAY WILLIAMS, CHAIRMAN CHILDREN'S VILLAGE, DOBBS FERRY, N. Y.

MR. WILLIAMS. Mr. Toastmaster and ladies and gentlemen. I take it that the very fact that this congress has assembled in this city at the call of the Chief Magistrate, and that you, citizens of this great nation, have come here this evening to discuss the questions that are before you, dispenses with any need on my part of entering at length into the reasons why we believe that the exploitation of the child should cease.

Childhood has been exploited for centuries. The commercialism, which has rested most heavily on the weakest members of society, is not a new thing. In the old Hebrew prophecies we may read that even in those days, quite as much as in our days, there was a tendency to lift the burdens from the shoulders of those who could bear them, and place those burdens upon the shoulders of the children, who could not bear them. We may read that a boy was sold for a pair of shoes and a girl for a bottle of wine. So this exploitation of childhood is no new story. The fact is the day has come when the nations are beginning to realize that that thing must cease. [Applause.] Arthur O'Shaughnessy is right when he says that "Each age is a dream that is dying or one that is coming to birth," and we are living to-day in that transition age when the dream of a false commercialism is dying, and the dream of a new civic righteousness is coming to birth. [Applause.]

We are not here to elaborate the reasons for a national children's bureau; but, alas, the history of all legislation, the history of all humanity, teaches us that knowledge of an evil is not enough to eradicate it. Evil changes its form, but it continues, and the chief reason why I, at least, advocate the national bureau is because I begin to believe that I see that new false alliance where commercialism, thinking it is about to be divided on certain lines, seeks new alliances. That is not new.

All religions—if I could correctly use the word religions when we are becoming to believe that all men are of one religion—the history of all cults, at any rate, teaches us that the easiest and most fatal of all hypocrisies is that which deceives others because it is largely self-deceived. Now, the danger of the exploitation of the child does not cease because you and I and our fellow-citizens have waked up to the fact that the child should have less work. This is no place and this is no time to enter at large into the reasons that lead me to believe that not a few of those commercial interests which have been so largely a matter of public comment and—thank God, I say—of public investigation, are beginning to feel that an alliance with the forces of righteousness, at least in name, would be wise. Not from one source only has come the suggestion that the methods of the so-called trust should be imported into philanthropy; not from one man, but from many sources. [Applause.] But the day that sees the marriage of commercialism to philanthropy sees the death of true work for children. [Applause.]

It is only because I believe so profoundly in democracy that I think the whole people are more to be trusted than any group who have behind them these subtle influences, that I believe in putting this power at the front. I am a democrat, not in politics, if you please, but by faith of conviction. [Applause.]

I believe that with all the shame of the city, with all the disgrace that I know of in so many places in our political life, the ultimate corruption is in business and not in politics. [Applause.] And I believe that you can not expect to stop the exploitation of the weak and helpless if you are going to trust the wolf to be judge in the case of the lamb.

I am not unconscious that my words may be misinterpreted. I am not afraid of misinterpretation. I think the time has come when in discussing this subject we should say what we mean. [Applause.] And I mean just this. That I believe in the federal power for the gathering of information as to childhood along the lines that have been detailed by Miss Wald, largely because I believe that is the way in which investigation that is fair, and investigation that will lead somewhere will be had; and I do not believe that it will be had in any other way. [Applause.]

Now, that is not because I have a mistrust of the good morals and the good intentions of my fellows, not even those from whom I differ; but because I so profoundly believe that the easiest line of deception is along the line that leads men to choose for leaders those who are conspicuous because they have been successful, as the world with its coarse thumb marks success. [Applause.]

Friends, the time has come when you have got to work the commercialism out of our system, if you expect to pursue your battle for those who are helpless.

One word more and I will be done. I take it that if we have anything in this great country of ours to congratulate ourselves upon it is the fact that we are gradually awakening to our own weakness. The great drawback of the American people heretofore has been their awful national self-complacency. We are beginning to understand not only that we do not know it all, but—oh, the pity of it—we have been bragging about things that were things when life was going down to death. And, God be thanked, although we differ profoundly, differ as to methods, differ as to ends, even, we have at least reached this unanimity of conviction: that life is sacred, and that the lower a life the more it needs help, and that the stronger the arm the larger the call on that arm to help the helpless.

You are met here in a high vocation. You are met here to help make real the things that are real, and you will never do it until you realize that among the things that are to be feared are the Greeks bringing gifts. [Applause.]

The TOASTMASTER. The discussion of the establishment of a children's bureau will be continued by one of the most active members of one of the most influential and useful State Boards of Charities in the United States, Rev. Francis H. Gavis, of Indiana.

ADDRESS OF REV. FRANCIS H. GAVISK, MEMBER STATE BOARD OF CHARITIES OF INDIANA.

This conference, called by the President of the United States, is a notable step in the child-saving movement.

I believe that the inception of almost every charitable effort is in the child. The helplessness of humanity finds its best illustration in the child and it is from the endeavor to relieve this dependency in the child that the circle of philanthropic effort has widened to include the inefficient and delinquent parent, because of the child.

There is no lack of interest in the welfare of children; that is part of our human nature; they nestle too closely to human hearts to ever lose a universal love and sympathy. This conference of men and women interested in the problems of philanthropy and charity need not be told that there is one cause for which we can obtain wide sympathy and ample support and that is for the child; and it is this human-wide sympathy that makes it possible to project and carry on so many agencies for the welfare of dependent children—some not well directed, some that result in positive harm to the objects of their intended benevolence.

In this conference there has been one note of universal harmony sounding in all the discussions—the dominant tone of the chorus of voices—and that is the desire to secure the best for the welfare of the child, the up bringing of the buds of humanity to useful growth, and to secure to the children their inalienable right—not a privilege we grant them, but a right to the possession of sound healthy bodies, to the proper education of their minds to the duties and responsibilities of citizenship—their right to a proper training for the race of life and the larger development of their capabilities, the duty on our part and the right on theirs to an understanding of their individual responsibility to the great Giver of Life for the salvation of their souls. I do not believe that you can divorce religion from this work of child saving. Were you to try to do so you would lose the most potent influence that surrounds child life; you would bring about results full of danger to society, and you would sever yourselves from a large company of devoted men and women who regard child saving as something more than human animal training, who look upon their work of child saving as an apostolate—sacred and divine, the development of children of men into the dignity of the children of God.

But with this dominant note of interest in the child, in this conference there have been divergent tones—not discords, but a sort of Wagnerian orchestration that will presently swell up into an inspiring harmony. These divergences have been as to the best methods of bringing about the result each one of us is looking for—the welfare of the dependent child. These divergences are as wide as the land we inhabit and as varied as the landscapes of our country. And if we seek for a reason for these differences—and I make every allowance for differences of local conditions—I think we will find it in the lack of accurate data and of scientific knowledge to meet the complex problems of child saving.

What we need is knowledge. I trust the large heart of the American people; I give full credit to the power of sentiment in human affairs, but that sentiment must be directed by knowledge; the heart must be ruled by the head. It seems to me that this conference

has demonstrated the need of some method of securing accurate information upon the subject of child saving.

Each of us has come from his sphere of work with little knowledge except of the work in his own country or State, and our examples and illustrations have been pictures with too much local color; we have drawn universal conclusions from particular premises. We need a larger view to establish principles in the philosophy of child saving. What has been done in other countries in the matter of the child has not been done by us as a nation. The National Child Labor Committee has done much in its sphere; it has called the attention of the nation to conditions existing in the industrial world, where children are employed, and its cry has been timely in preventing a repetition of the infamies that characterized the British industries in the last century. The cry has not been unheeded; public opinion, that great factor in this Republic of freemen, has been aroused and has borne fruit in legislation in some of the States to protect the child and to secure for him his rights to proper education and development. But the committee, well and zealously as it has done its work, has touched only one phase of the child problem, the industrial side. But a work involving this many-sided question of childhood should not be left to private initiative and organization. Rabbi Hirsch well said, last evening, that the nation is waking up to the necessity of conserving its material resources. We have bureaus and bureaus to aid and develop commerce and to preserve to posterity the priceless material legacy that God has given to this nation. Let us, at last, do something to conserve that which is most vital, the children, the only real asset of a nation.

The Federal Bureau of Education studies the child question, but only as it affects the general system of education; the Bureau of Labor studies the child, but only as it is affected in the industrial world as a juvenile wage-earner. Between these two views of the child there arise many questions running the whole gamut between birth and the period of developed manhood and womanhood. We need some authoritative source to gather and disseminate information touching upon childhood in every phase to give answer to the propositions that have been laid before this conference. And it seems to me that this can best be done by federal authority in some department of the General Government like that proposed in the children's bureau bill. Such a bureau, with trained experts, could secure reliable data as to children, the causes of dependency, the results of home placing, the outcome of institution training. It could coordinate results of child saving in various sections of the country. Its statistical information would unify results of varying systems of child saving, and it could speedily inform those interested in the work of the results of investigation by means of bulletins issued without delay. Individual States indeed might do much, but the information would be necessarily local, without coordination, and would leave the problem of childhood as chaotic as it is now. It seems to me that only by federal effort can the work be done—not that I favor federal regulation of child care, even if that were possible under our system of government, but a national bureau to study the child problem and to disseminate the information it gathers, to instruct those engaged in child saving, and to influence legislation in the several States for the benefit of the child.

It is a great thing for the country, it seems to me, that the Chief Executive of this great Republic has taken time from his many onerous duties to give thought to this great subject, to call this conference in the capital of the nation and to honor this gathering with his presence as its presiding officer. He has done honor to his humanity that he has left the great cares of state to consider the best welfare of the weak and helpless of our race. But it is well worth his and our while. They are the future citizens of our country. It was of these that the Master said: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven."

The **TOASTMASTER**. We will be favored a little later in the evening with the presence of the Secretary of the Interior, in whose department it is proposed to place the federal children's bureau.

The three other speakers of the evening have been assigned the topic "The Significance of the Conference." The special purpose of that is to permit them to talk about any subject they wish to talk about. I do not know why Mr. Metz's title is spelled comptroller, for it really is, as it sounds "controller," and next to the mayor—if we need make that exception—the head of the finance department is at the head of the great city of New York. The administration of that department during the last four years has been marked by very distinguished ability. Wide business experience has been brought to bear upon the financial problems of that great city. And yet I suspect that the comptroller would prefer to be known best not as a man who reorganized the finances of the city of New York, but as we know him a man also of quick sympathies, ready to help every good cause. When we desire to bring the great international tuberculosis exhibit from Washington to New York, we not only count upon prompt, effective, official assistance, but upon his very generous personal assistance. But not only the tuberculosis movement has been near his heart; I suspect that he cares most of all about the children, the great body of children who are the wards of that great city.

I present to you Hon. Herman A. Metz, of New York.

ADDRESS OF HON. HERMAN A. METZ, COMPTROLLER OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, I am reminded by the very flattering remarks of the toastmaster of a little side remark of Miss Wald's. She said she would much rather meet me here than in the board of estimate and apportionment. I quite appreciate just what she meant. I assure you, that as much as I sympathize with many appeals that are made to that board, officially it is quite another matter, and I have got to go down to the practical side of a question in all instances and ask whose money is to be spent and where it is coming from and how is it to be used.

No one appreciates more than I do the effective work done by private organizations in the city of New York. When I heard to-day that there were 93,000 dependent children in the United States, I just wondered how many realized that one-third of that number were right in the city of New York, that the city of New York contributes to-day practically one-third of all those in the United States.

In the 48 institutions for children that we have that come directly under my jurisdiction as comptroller, in the final analysis—for pay-

ment is always the final analysis—they have nearly 30,000 children annually to look after, and it becomes quite a problem as to whether the city of New York itself, as such, really owes it itself to alone take care of all those children, privately and publicly. We are the gateway of the whole country. Thousands of them are not citizens; their parents are not citizens of the city of New York. They are transient and their parents go elsewhere in the country to build up the United States. It becomes a great question whether the Federal Government is not as much interested there as the city of New York. This is one reason I am glad to be here and take part in this conference.

I have learned a great deal more than I knew before as to the conditions in South Dakota, as to the conditions in other parts of the country, but none of them compare with the conditions in the city of New York; it is a national problem as well as a problem for the city of New York, and it is justly a problem for the Federal Government, something that should be looked after by the United States, in my opinion.

I do not say this from a financial standpoint, but because the whole country is dependent on what we do in New York City with those children. They are a part of the citizenship of the United States. I have made it a point to visit a great many of our institutions, a great many of all religious faiths and denominations. I listened with great deal of interest to the suggestions as to the placing in private homes. No possible question can exist as to the advantage of a private home. But I recall to mind a picture when a short time ago I went with his grace, Archbishop Farley, to visit a home of the Dominican Sisters near Blaubelt, N. Y. I do not know how many there were there, but at the confirmation exercise which we saw, there were about 200 confirmed that day. A function of that sort is always impressive, and especially so in the Catholic Church. The archbishop, in his lovable way and gentle voice, spoke to the children and explained to them what a sacrifice was. He said: "I want you all to-day to promise to make a sacrifice." He told them in language which they could all understand that a sacrifice meant the giving up of something they wanted. He illustrated it by saying, "Now, if you want an apple and instead of eating it yourself you give it to someone else who wants it, that would be a sacrifice." He went on to say, "The sacrifice I want you to make is to promise me to-day that you will not taste a drop of liquor until you are 21 years old."

No, to my mind, that pledge could not be made under more impressive circumstances. They will bear that strongly in mind as long as they live.

In all the discussions before the conference the one that appealed to me most, and I must begin to get back to the practical standpoint, was the remark made by Professor Henderson as to the sacrifice of human life and the production of orphans in that way. Now, I think if we owe anything to any children it is to the children of hardworking parents, the children of fathers who are trying their best to make a living in the mine or in the factory and who are accidentally killed in the performance of their work and whose dear ones are then dependent upon private charity.

As a manufacturer myself I know that we are behind, I was going to say a century behind, the countries of Europe in many respects. I know in my particular line of manufacture, which is the manufacture of chemicals, that Germany, France, in fact all Europe, are far ahead of us. They can not get men to work over there in the way in which they work over here, because the Government will not allow it. The extra hazardous places over there are inspected twice a day. In my plant in New Jersey, if a man falls into a vat and meets his death, it is his own fault; no one is responsible. If he is insured, his family of course gets the insurance, but that is no satisfaction to them if he is killed. In Europe, those things are looked after by the Government. They have a fund over there. So much is taken out of the wages of all to create an insurance fund. The Government provides that you shall do so and so; that the manufacturing establishment shall set aside a fund to protect the widow and orphan. And they do it. [Applause.]

Mr. Wilder said he would welcome an employer's liability bill. So do I. But I want the man in the next State to have the same bill, because if the men in the next State did not have the same law then I could not compete. Let us be practical. Those things are federal propositions and not state propositions. [Applause.]

The manufacturer to-day in New England is handicapped not by freights but by the fact that in the South they have child labor and fourteen-hour labor. That is what handicaps him. And unless you get federal legislation which will regulate in all the States this proposition you are going to handicap instead of benefit those for whom you are pleading in your own State. Those are government functions and the quicker the Government takes them up the better. The States can not do much along those lines by themselves.

We are still on the old plan. While we make laws and regulations that regulate the price of beef and protect cattle, human flesh is still the cheapest thing in the market. We have got to raise the price of that. I thank you. [Applause.]

The TOASTMASTER: Secretary Garfield has sent the following letter:

SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1909.

MY DEAR MR. FOLKS: I very much regret that it is impossible for me to be present and speak this evening on the proposed bill for the establishment of a bureau in the Interior Department to be known as the "Children's Bureau."

I am in hearty sympathy with this movement, believing that there is urgent need for the kind of investigation which is suggested in the proposed measure. The Federal Government has a positive duty to perform in connection with the study of the welfare of children. Its agents can obtain much information which can not be obtained by other governmental jurisdictions. The work would in no way conflict with the work of the States and municipalities, but would supplement and correlate their work. I sincerely hope that Congress will at this session take favorable action upon this measure.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES RUDOLPH GARFIELD, *Secretary*.

HON. HOMER FOLKS, *Vice-Chairman*,
Conference on the Care of Dependent Children, New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.

The TOASTMASTER. While we are waiting a moment I would like to announce that there will be, to-morrow morning at half past 10 at the Capitol, a hearing before the committee of the House of Representatives upon this federal children's bureau bill. It will be held

before the committee in charge of the appropriations for the Department of the Interior. Delegates to this conference are invited to be present at that hearing.

At this point President Roosevelt came upon the platform, and the toastmaster continued as follows:

Mr. President, we have taken counsel together on the subjects which you asked us to consider, and I am particularly pleased to be able to report to you that we have reached some conclusions unanimously. A copy of those conclusions has been placed in your hands.

We will, therefore, not detain you to listen to the reading of them; but I will ask our secretary, Mr. West, to read the briefest possible syllabus of the main points of the conclusions.

Mr. West read as follows:

I have the honor to present the syllabi of conference resolutions:

1. Home care: Children of worthy parents or deserving mothers should, as a rule, be kept with their parents at home.

2. Preventive work: Society should endeavor to eradicate causes of dependency like disease and to substitute compensation and insurance for relief.

3. Home finding: Homeless and neglected children, if normal, should be cared for in families, when practicable.

4. Cottage system: Institutions should be on the cottage plan with small units, as far as possible.

5. Incorporation: Agencies caring for dependent children should be incorporated, on approval of a suitable state board.

6. State inspection: The State should inspect the work of all agencies which care for dependent children.

7. Inspection of educational work: Educational work of institutions and agencies caring for dependent children should be supervised by state educational authorities.

8. Facts and records: Complete histories of dependent children and their parents should be recorded for guidance of child-caring agencies.

9. Physical care: Every needy child should receive the best medical and surgical attention, and be instructed in health and hygiene.

10. Cooperation: Local child-caring agencies should cooperate and establish joint bureaus of information.

11. Undesirable legislation: Prohibitive legislation against transfer of dependent children between States should be repealed.

12. Permanent organization: A permanent organization for work along the lines of these resolutions is desirable.

13. Federal Children's Bureau: Establishment of a Federal Children's Bureau is desirable, and enactment of pending bill is earnestly recommended.

We request that you send a special message to Congress favoring Federal Children's Bureau and other legislation applying above principles to District of Columbia and other federal territory.

Respectfully submitted.

[Prolonged applause.]

The TOASTMASTER. Ladies and gentlemen, the President. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AT THE BANQUET OF THE CONFERENCE ON DEPENDENT CHILDREN, THE NEW WILLARD, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 26, 1909.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT. Messrs. Vice-chairmen, ladies, and gentlemen. It is a great pleasure to me to come here this evening and congratulate you upon the amount of work that you have done, and I need hardly say that its value is immeasurably increased because it represents your unanimous judgment. It would be a good thing for other bodies to remember that a chronically divided court is not a source of strength. [Laughter and applause.] I am particularly pleased at the way in which you have been able to act in harmony, at

the excellent feeling that has prevailed. Among very earnest, very zealous men and women it is not always that one finds the saving grace of common sense; and this body stands in startling contrast to some other most well-meaning and philanthropic bodies in having shown so much of that homely and indispensable quality. [Applause.]

Seriously, friends, when we come here in the name of broad-minded charity it is gratifying to know that the broad-mindedness and the charity have been shown among your own selves. Yet you have not secured agreement at the cost of strength. I congratulate you upon the progressive and constructive character of the platform to the outline of which I have just listened.

I am sorry to learn that there are States which have passed such restrictive legislation as that complained of. A State has an entire right to prevent diseased or morally defective children coming within its borders; but the normal child who, through misfortune, has been deprived of a home of his or her own, and for whom the endeavor is to supply such a home, that child may be a source of strength and not of weakness to the State. It should be the object of all good Americans, no matter in what State they live, to see that child put into a family where the chances are that it will grow up to be a good man or a good woman. I hope that the state legislatures will not persevere in this narrow path, will not persevere in a course of conduct which means a refusal to do each his duty by his neighbor.

Now, I do not think that it is necessary for me to say what I am about to say, and yet on the off chance of its being necessary I shall say it: That at no time has any responsible person in this meeting, or persons responsible for the organization of this meeting, referred to those engaged in any form of child-saving work, and especially to members of the boards of directors of institutions, save in a temper and spirit that recognized in the fullest degree the good done by those men and the good that they aim to accomplish. Continually as we proceed with work for the betterment of our people we find that agencies which were the best possible agencies a decade, or a couple of decades, or three decades ago, have been passed by; that their usefulness is greatly diminished compared to other new agencies. We are not attacking good men and good women who did so much in the past, or the good man and good woman who are engaged in trying to do good along the same old ways, when we advocate an improvement in the ways. Whenever I come into close contact with men and women such as those before me, one of the first things I have to find out is that the methods in which I cordially believed, because they were the principles according to which I worked thirty years ago, may have passed by. We were then in the muzzle-loading stage in the fight against evil. Men and women did mighty good work with the muzzle-loaders; but we need to use breech-loaders now. It is no assault upon the captains of hundreds and captains of tens who still naturally cling to the weapons of their youth when we advocate an improvement in the instruments with which we strive to meet the evil in the conditions of to-day. We recognize to the fullest degree the importance of all that is being done in this field of endeavor. What we are trying to do is to lay especial stress upon the most important of the different forms of work.

Institutions have a great part to play, but the most important of all institutions is the home; and where we have to utilize an institution as a substitute for the home it is well to make the unit of influence as small as possible—that is, to adopt the so-called cottage plan, so as to reproduce as nearly as may be the conditions that make the home of such inestimable value to the growing child. [Applause.]

I would like to say one word, especially to all who have any control whatsoever in any institution, in any society, and that is that they should take the utmost possible care to have no employee who is not of the best possible character in any position which will bring that employee in contact in any way with the children of the institution. It is an evil thing to have a bad public servant in any capacity. It is not merely an evil but a criminal thing to permit any employee, public or private, in an institution where children are peculiarly liable to temptation, peculiarly liable to have their principles perverted, unless that employee is of a character concerning which we are absolutely certain. There is no excuse for employing a man or woman in such an institution merely because there is not anything known against his or her character. There should be affirmative knowledge of the good character and efficiency of every individual employed in any capacity around an institution where these children are being educated to be the citizens of the future. The odds are heavy enough against them anyhow, and we must try just so far as in us lies to minimize those odds.

I very earnestly hope that the managers, the directors, of all institutions and societies throughout the United States will carefully study the recommendations of this body of experts. I hope that this study will be given alike by the men in public and the men in private life; that legislators, public officials, philanthropists, will try to apply these principles in their philanthropic work for children. I hope they will recognize not only what is good but what is wise in what you have recommended. If there is any one quality, if there is any one failing against which it is necessary that a philanthropist should always be on his or her guard, it is the failing of permitting the avoidance of hardness of heart to carry him or her into the cultivation of softness of head. It is just as necessary to be wise as it is to have good intentions. [Applause.]

So far I have congratulated you on your work. I must not confine myself only to talking of what you are to do. I must speak of what I am to do. I am one of those public officials who are to profit by what you have done. I shall show that I have thus profited by, as a matter of course, acting favorably on the requests you embody in the last paragraph of the report. I shall send a special message to Congress, recommending the establishment of a federal children's bureau, and recommending laws for the District of Columbia and the Federal Territories which shall in practical fashion apply the principles and methods that you advocate. I want to explain to the ladies and gentlemen present that when I have sent such a message to Congress it does not do any good to write and ask me why it is not passed. Excellent people now and then get me to recommend something, and then write me in great indignation to inquire why I have not made it a law. I will send the message to Congress, and then you do your best to get it made into a

law. I will do all I can to help it, but I have got to have your help to that end. [Laughter and applause.]

I am sincerely glad to have had the chance of greeting you to-night. I thank you for the great work you have done, and I will do all that in me lies to see that that work as regards the Federal Capital and the Federal Government bears immediate fruit. [Cheering and long applause.]

The **TOASTMASTER**. What should we do without "our Ben."

ADDRESS OF HON. BEN. B. LINDSEY, JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT, DENVER, COLO.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONFERENCE.

Judge LINDSEY. Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen. The hour is late, and I hope I shall not keep you long. I am sure I will be false to my feelings if I do not express to you my great appreciation of the opportunity of being able to join with others this evening in saying a word as to the significance of this conference and one or two important problems that it has, I am glad to say, brought forcibly to our attention as bearing upon the great subject of child dependency.

This splendid set of resolutions was unanimously and harmoniously adopted, my friends manifesting a "getting together," as it were, in the interests of the children in a forward movement such as we have never enjoyed before.

In the history of the work for children, as emphasized on this occasion, I am reminded of an experience with one of those good-hearted, well-meaning little street urchins who became one of my friends. He lived in a difficult neighborhood. I prefer to call it that rather than a bad neighborhood. Conditions were bad. He was the leader of his gang. But there were other gangs, and the gangs sometimes had their troubles and their differences, and they were not always together. There were in the neighborhood Jewish boys and Irish boys, and naturally the leaders sometimes came into conflict. In the neighborhood we started the boys' club and made a few other suggestions for overcoming the difficulties we had experienced. I remember this little Irish friend of mine, the leader of his gang, became interested in the proceedings, and he determined to organize a baseball team that was to compete with the balance of the baseball teams made up of boys of the same age in the town. I had often talked to those youngsters upon two subjects. One was the advantage of getting together, and the other the evils of bad habits.

My little Irish urchin used great discrimination in selecting his baseball team. They won all their games. And one day, when he lined them up to explain to the judge how it happened, I was curious to see what he would say. If he had been a little priggish I am sure he would have said, "Judge, it is because we have cut out the swearing and the smoking;" but he did not. He said, "Judge, I will tell you why we won. It is because we got together for the right, like you told us." I asked him to tell me further about it, and he said: "Judge, you see half these kids is Jews and half is Irish, and when the Irish and the Jews gets together they beats anything that comes down the pike." [Laughter.]

I said, "But there are nine boys in a baseball team. How do you make it out that they are half Irish and half Jews?" Quicker than a flash he replied, "That's nothing; the ninth one on the team is the pitcher and he is the best one on the team; he is an Irish Jew." Then he trotted out with great pride the pitcher, who happened to be that exceptional, but occasional thing, a red-headed Jewish boy. I was curious to know where the Irish came in, and he explained it this way: He said, "You see this kid is red-headed and his name is Greenstein. The green and the red is Irish and the stain is Jew." [Laughter.]

My friends, it seems to me that the most significant thing in this conference is that we are all together on what in the past, perhaps, has been considered, at least in part, to be mooted questions. And surely these resolutions, capping the climax of an interesting conference, is the splendid and best result of it all.

My friends, I would feel false to the cause of childhood if I did not to-night in a somewhat serious, but I hope not too lengthy moment, point out one or two important vital subjects that we must consider if we are going to do our full duty by this child.

The President of the United States, who has so honored us, and, as was so well said to-night, has honored humanity by his interest in this conference, has in my judgment said or rather made declarations in the past which, however important may be those made upon this occasion, were infinitely more significant and important as they relate to this subject.

In his message to Congress, December, 1904, the President said:

The prime duty of the man is to work, to be the breadwinner; the prime duty of the woman is to be the mother, the housewife.

All questions of tariff and finance sink into utter insignificance when compared with the tremendous, the vital importance of trying to shape conditions so that these two duties of the man and of the woman can be fulfilled under reasonably favorable circumstances.

We can not, then, fairly consider the problem of the dependent child unless we consider its relation to the great industrial, social, and political questions which concern us as a nation. The child is the state and the state is the child, and in a fair discussion of the problems of the child you can not escape the problems of democracy. We are not here to felicitate ourselves upon what we have done, but rather, to determine what we ought to do, and through unceasing, relentless effort to see that it is done. Perhaps no form of heroism so appeals to the sentiment or the imagination as the rescue of a little child when its peril is imminent. The child endangered by the onrushing train, the burning school building, will strike the spark of heroism and divinity in every human soul. There are tens of thousands of children every year in this nation beset by perils not less imminent because they are less apparent. These perils are so many and due to such varied causes that it is not my purpose to attempt to classify or discuss them in any relative importance. Indeed, until we have a better defined governmental policy, which may come from such possibilities as the children's bureau, to present reliable facts, it would be somewhat hazardous to attempt any such classification.

I wish to point out some of these causes and to refer to possible remedies. I am not here to underestimate the importance of that

greatest of all relief measures—the placing of dependent children in good family homes under proper supervision and protection by the State, yet if we limit our efforts in behalf of the dependent child to that remedy or to the institution of whatever character we shall be nearer false than faithful to the cause of childhood. We must go down deep into the causes of poverty and ignorance which is responsible for most of our dependency and crime. We must also be aroused to the injunction of the Master, “Bear ye another’s burdens.” We must begin to seriously consider the kind of sane, sensible industrialism recently discussed by Dr. Lyman Abbott, President Theodore Roosevelt, Mr. Carnegie, and Mr. Taft. Doctor Abbott has called it industrial socialism. Bismarck fought for ten years in Germany for a system whereby the capitalist who draws the dividends and the public that reap the benefits may justly and equitably share with the man who does the work some of the risk and hazards of dangerous occupations. In line with the policy of the great German statesman, the employers’ liability and compensatory laws recently recommended by the President will begin to bring that simple justice for many a family that in the end will be one of the most powerful factors in preventing the dependency of children. Child dependency is just as much due to the weakness and injustice in our social and political system as to the folly, ignorance, immorality, and intemperance of parents. This injustice has been too long tolerated by the legislatures and often enforced by courts whose decisions, while often lawful, as might makes law, are nevertheless in many cases relics of feudalism and barbarism. Because of their persistent refusal to readjust their glasses in viewing in a different light an entirely new scene than that contemplated centuries ago when these precedents were made to protect property rather than human life and character, they have in this respect often contributed more to injustice than to justice.

Two thousand years ago in order that he might keep his throne, Herod sent his soldiers to murder the innocents. Two thousand years after in order that property might retain its place of power we are, perhaps unintentionally, converting what are supposed to be instruments of democracy and justice into invisible and equally dangerous assaults on the children of this nation. While I am opposed to any scheme that does not protect property, so I am more opposed to any scheme that does not do justice to human life and character. Just in proportion as we neglect through the legislative and judicial departments of our Government to cast aside the absurd sophistries that we hypocritically use as arguments for industrial liberty, when the men who announce them know or ought to know they contribute to individual slavery, so do we handicap the home and the parent with injustice and from this injustice the child suffers most.

The place for the child is in its own home, with its own parents, where this is at all consistent with the ordinary rights of the child and parent, and we can never keep that child in that home until we have to the full extent of the powers of government protected that home and the parent in the home, and that we are not doing as we should do. The cry of the dependent child is first for justice; and this first, if it means anything, justice for his parents from the state, from the social order, before we can hope for or expect natural duties or even justice from the parent to the child; before we can hope for

or expect what President Roosevelt said was one of our greatest questions, "trying to shape conditions so that the two duties of the man and of the woman may be fulfilled under reasonably favorable circumstances." Most of the dependent children of the nation are the children of laboring people, children of the poor, the miserable and the unfortunate, and while we should not for one instant permit to escape us the greater and often inexcusable causes of dependency, such as shiftlessness, immorality, and intemperance, neither should we let these blind us to the industrial barbarism and injustice of this age, which is one of the greatest causes of child dependency.

It is a splendid thing to get a fatherless child in a childless home, but it is a better thing to save the father to the child—to preserve the natural parent to the child in its natural home. We have all read the amazing statistics in recent years, showing the awful sacrifice of health, strength, intelligence, and life in certain of the great industries of this nation, and its neglected and congested centers. And we stand aghast to find it is increasing rather than decreasing. I firmly believe it is responsible for not less than a million dependent and delinquent children in every generation of childhood. Has it been sufficiently brought home to us that there is even a greater loss sustained not only to those dependent upon the victims but to society and the nation? We all suffer in the end just so as we neglect through justice, sanity, and wisdom to strengthen the industrial and economic conditions which concern each individual home and the parent who must shoulder or shirk or fall under its responsibilities. In insisting upon this we are only insisting upon the protection of the child, and we can not begin at a better place than to begin right there; and just in proportion as we do justice to and improve the conditions of the toilers in the nation, just to that extent do we decrease the opportunities for child dependency.

If the public institutions of this nation are taking care of their hundreds of thousands of dependent children, the home-finding agencies of their fifty thousand, you can count upon it that the near relatives of the parent are caring for their tens of thousands.

The child is born into the world with the Divine heritage of a natural father's firm and guiding hand and a natural mother's love, and yet we know there are hundreds of thousands bereft of both, through no fault of their own. Let me relate a tragedy of childhood. Let us examine this case from one family: Mother and five children; oldest boy, 11, brought in for delinquency—robbing the box car—the younger children for dependency because of the questionable "boarder" living in the shack down near the railroad tracks. Mother becomes alarmed at threatened proceedings and marries the boarder. The mother loves her children; she threatens suicide lest they be taken away from her. According to her testimony, the father is recently deceased. While in life he really saw little of this boy. He arose not later than 6 o'clock in the morning, worked all day amidst the poisonous fumes and gases of a great industry, returned home by 7 in the evening tired and worn out. Now, perhaps he took to drink because he was miserable, and he may have deserted the mother, as tens of thousands of mothers in this country are deserted every year and forced into the double burden of home maker and breadwinner. He might have died of tuberculosis because of breathing the kind of dust described last week in court to me by a mother in leaving her

the burden and responsibility of the children, or his life may have been shortened through weakening of the nervous system through the speeding of machines, or his life made worthless through seeking solace from the results in drugs or drink, all causes of broken homes within my experience; but in this particular case the husband was blown up in the slag pile of the great industry.

The mother says the railroad company paid her a few hundred dollars on condition that she would sign a paper. That paper she did not understand. She never knew the deceased had worked for the railroad. But there had been a long struggle for an eight-hour law to protect just such fathers of possible dependent children. It finally emerged a half reality. It seemed at least to clear up some of the confusion in the case. The man who was working on the slag pile, it was explained, had been transferred from the pay roll of the great industry to the pay roll of the railroad company. The eight-hour law applied to one and not the other. Now, I want to ask you if the salvation of the dependent child from a home like that is ever going to come merely through putting children in an institution or in the best of family homes. I have known men of millions who give liberally to children's institutions who would back a corporation fund to debauch a legislature to defeat an eight-hour law or an employer's liability or compensatory law. We may well rejoice to be with those who pick up the appealing child who has been thrown in the path of the juggernaut, but what shall be said of us if we do nothing to cripple or destroy the offending monster?

In a recent address before the American Academy of Political and Social Science Mr. Frederick L. Hoffman, statistician of one of the great insurance companies, in an able address upon the physical and medical aspects of labor and industry, presents some amazing statistics of mortality among the workers in certain trades and industries. Note, for instance, the relation to child dependency of the one fact there recited that over one thousand women are made widows, while over two thousand children are made orphans, annually just from fatalities in the one industry of coal mining alone.

The laws of the various States are designed to care for dependent children up to their sixteenth year. Therefore, within this period of years we would have alone from this one industry 32,000 orphans and 16,000 widows.

On the basis of the report of the Commissioner of Labor, made a number of years ago, it is computed that the industrial accident rate in the factories of New York State reaches the appalling figures of 44 to 1,000, and that more than 232,000 factory employees are killed or injured every year in the United States. Mining and railway casualties bring the total slaughter, mutilation, and other injuries up to more than 524,000 cases annually, a record which makes that of any twelve-month history of any war pale into insignificance. The entire losses in killed and wounded of the recent war between Russia and Japan is reported as 333,786. This does not include the hundreds of thousands of toilers who are killed or disabled in occupations notoriously injurious to health. This nation has never yet awakened up to the heroism of its women, forced as they are by the hundreds of thousands out of their natural sphere as home maker into the added burden of breadwinner, clinging always and ever to the child, enduring hardships, privations, and struggles every day of their

lives as great as that endured by any soldiery in the darkest days of a nation's wars. It is only the mother love, the heroic sacrifices of the brave-hearted women, the noble mothers which have saved us from the flood of helpless and dependent orphan children yielded up as the flotsam and jetsam of this awful struggle.

We are told that the increase of casualties among the toilers is due in part to the lack of proper enforceable safety regulations, which have been insisted upon and obtained in European countries, in some of which the accident death rate among coal miners alone is less than one to every thousand employed, while the American ratio is $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 1,000, being three and one-half times that of some of the European nations. Now, my friends, suppose we can reduce the number of widows and orphans in coal mines alone during the sixteen-year period of possible dependency from 32,000 orphans to 10,000 orphans, from 16,000 widows to 5,000 widows. What has been done in the European countries can be done in this country, but it will not be done until men become less selfish, less disposed to defeat legislation designed to protect the home. Just in proportion then as we improve these conditions, to that extent do we reduce the opportunities and causes for child dependency and child crime.

It is not my intention to overlook the very important relation of the liquor problem to the destitution and neglect of children. In a volume entitled "The Economic Aspects of the Liquor Problem," prepared by Mr. John Koren, a man widely known for his violent opposition to prohibition political theories, and bearing a reputation for conservatism in such matter, it is declared:

As the general percentage of the destitution and neglect of children, due to the liquor habits of their parents, we get 44.92, which the intemperance of guardians and others increases to 45.83.

But I think sometimes we may be shortsighted on this question. In the volume I have referred to on the importance of labor conditions in the United States we are forcibly reminded of the number of individuals who, because of certain trying conditions, are driven to drink because they are miserable.

Far be it from me to make any apology for those weaklings and human wrecks of society for whom there is neither palliation nor excuse, and there are thousands of such responsible for dependent children. Far be it from me to distract your attention from the immorality of men and women, even resulting from the lack of education, which in turn may come from the shortcomings of parent and State, but I do wish to impress upon this conference the fact that there can be no real fight for childhood in this nation if we overlook in our plea for the proper care of the dependent child, the more important plea of justice to the home of the child and the parent responsible for that home.

I have come here in no boasting spirit, but I think it is only a matter of justice to state that so far as it has come to my knowledge, in 1901 in the Fifty-seventh Congress, a children's bureau was proposed by a bill introduced by Congressman John Shafroth, of Denver, now governor of Colorado, at the instance of the Colorado bureau of child and animal protection. It not only had the support of that bureau, but that of the juvenile court, the then chief justices and governor of the State, and our legislature by memorial to Congress in 1905 recommended its passage. Mr. E. K. Whitehead, of Denver,

wrote the text of the bill. It included the protection of dumb animals as well as children. The bill having first been introduced in 1901 was reintroduced in 1903 and again in 1905, being urged by all workers for children in our State.

Therefore, we of Colorado especially rejoice that a national children's bureau seems now to be a probability instead of a possibility. We need this bureau. We have seen the necessity for it in the various national organizations for the protection of children, which are poorly equipped and terribly handicapped to conduct investigations of the character the welfare of the children of the nation so vitally demands. Facts are the most powerful factors in reforms. We must first get at the causes, the real causes of disease, before we can hope to find the real remedies, and with all due respect to child-placing agencies and institutions, and conceding their immediate advantage and help and continuous need, I believe their relation to the real disease is rather that of the salve to the sore when the blood of the patient is polluted and demands real remedies for the elimination of poison from the system. Congress will be false to its duty to the children of the nation if it fails to establish the national children's bureau. It must, of course, be cooperative with a society by other governmental agencies, but the welfare of the children of the nation is too vital to the future of the nation and the well-being of us all to expect through bureaus and departments to do a work that belongs to specialists interested first and last in the child, and those are things in our social, economic, political, and educational affairs that bear upon the welfare of the child. The chief sign of the real work necessary comes from such private agencies as the Sage Foundation, materially equipped to do the work, an advantage that some other private agencies do not have.

If the child is the state in embryo, why should not the state look after itself, for is not the future of the state wrapped up in these little ones?

And now, as in opening so in closing, let me quote again not from the message of the President, but from his words to us in Colorado nearly eight years ago at the Pikes Peak centennial celebration in the shadow of our mountains:

Just one word on the future of the country—the country as it will be twenty, thirty, or forty years hence. A good deal depends upon how we handle business, how we do our great industrial work, how we handle the farms and ranches, but what counts most is the kind of men and women that there are at that time in the country. No nation is safe unless in the average family there are healthy, happy children. If these children are not brought up well they are not merely a curse to themselves and their parents, but they mean the ruin of the state in the future.

[Loud and prolonged applause.]

The TOASTMASTER. MACK.

ADDRESS OF HON. JULIAN W. MACK, FORMERLY JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT OF CHICAGO.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Toastmaster, friends, I shall endeavor to be as brief as the chairman. The keynote, preventive work. To my mind, that is the significant thing of this conference. Not what we shall do for the dependent child of to-day, not whether he shall go into an institution, be it a congregate or a cottage, or into a family home, but how shall we stop dependency? [Applause.]

How shall we save our children from the difficulties and the troubles of solving the problems of what to do with dependent children?

Let us get at the causes and eradicate them; let us get together with all those working for a social betterment.

Study the causes. See that in each community tuberculosis is eradicated, for it is a preventable disease; that typhoid does not become epidemic in the homes; that accidents are guarded against; and that the opportunity to work and to work at a living wage be given to the man who seeks employment, so that he may not become an applicant for relief and his children may not become dependent upon the community. [Applause.]

See to it, through legislation and otherwise, primarily through the initiative of the wise employer, that as part of his wages pension funds be created so that when old age or accident comes, as they will come, to the workingman, he need not apply to the charity office or send his children to us, who are to determine what is to become of them; so that he may be enabled, not through charity, but through justice, through his own earnings, by his just deserts, to keep his family together. [Applause.]

That, to my mind, ladies and gentlemen, is the keynote of this conference.

Of course until we eradicate poverty, until social justice shall prevail, we shall have dependents among us, and therefore we must study how best to deal with them.

And so the second note of the conference is the recognition that the home is the best place for the child, that every child deserves that which you give to your child, that which you will always want for your child—individualized care and love.

I care not how wise, how kind, how noble the superintendent or matron of an orphan asylum of 500 boys and girls, the father or the mother of a cottage of 25 children may be, they can not satisfy the child heart's cravings for individual love, and that individual love and care, that opportunity to pour out its petty troubles—petty to us, but great to the child at the moment, and great for its whole development—an opportunity to pour out those troubles on a mother's breast should be given to it. [Applause.]

Some one said that we must take some of these children into an institution so as to train them properly, so as to give them the industrial education that we think the boys and girls ought to have. It is a shame on our civilization to-day, if it can be truthfully said, as it has been said, and as I fear it is truthfully said, that a child must become a delinquent or a dependent and be sent to some of our best institutions before it can receive the real instruction for life. [Applause.]

Let us aim in our public schools for our children, for all the children, to give them the kind of education that we believe is necessary in order to fit them for the battle of life. Do not let us give the little ones that go out to work at 14 years of age or 15 an education that does not fit them for the battle of life, that sends them out helpless and worthless to a large extent, that enables them, compels them, in fact, to become in many cases worthless loafers, and thereby to become the fathers and mothers of the dependents of the future.

Let us see to it that in our public schools they get an education that will enable them to fight the battle of life manfully, to support themselves, to become worthy citizens, fit to be the mothers and fathers of the future, and able when they do become the mothers and fathers of the future, to care for their families and not to allow them to become dependent. [Applause.]

Those, ladies and gentlemen, are to my mind the notes struck together in one harmonious chord in this conference, wherein Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, priests and laymen, superintendents of orphan asylums, and directors of home-finding societies have met together, and, remarkable as it may seem to some—yet, when we consider the progress of the last few years, it is not so remarkable—united in the principles which should govern this work for the future; no longer remarkable, I say, because, however much we may differ with Theodore Roosevelt in many of the things for which he has stood, I believe we must all say that to him this country owes a great debt, that under him the country has become more united than ever before, and that under him men and women have learned through his example to work together harmoniously, generously, for the common good. [Applause.]

The TOASTMASTER. One and all, we thank you.

(Adjourned.)

ACTION TAKEN BY THE PRESIDENT IN THE MATTER OF PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 30, 1909.

MY DEAR MR. WEST: Referring to paragraph 12 of the conclusions of the conference on the care of dependent children, addressed to me, with reference to a permanent organization, I heartily concur in the opinion of the conference therein expressed. There is a great field of usefulness for such a permanent voluntary organization as suggested.

The resolution states that such an organization would be desirable and helpful if reasonably assured of adequate and financial support. To consider this contingency and to take such other action as may be deemed wise to perfect this permanent organization, I hereby request you to act with Mr. Thomas M. Mulry and Mr. Homer Folks as a committee, with power to increase the membership thereof in such way as in the judgment of the committee seems wise.

Sincerely, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

MR. JAMES E. WEST,
1343 Clifton Street NW., Washington, D. C.

LETTER SENT BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE GOVERNORS OF ALL THE STATES AND TERRITORIES.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 2, 1909.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: I send herewith a copy of a letter addressed to me embodying the conclusions of the conference on the care of dependent children, held upon my invitation in Washington, January 25 and 26.

Paragraph 15 of the conclusions recommends that I cause to be transmitted to the governor of each State of the Union a copy of the proceedings of the conference for the information of the state board of charities or other bodies exercising similar powers. I have given directions that this be done.

Without waiting for the publication of the proceedings in full, I am sending the conclusions of the conference for such immediate use as you may care to make of the same. Additional copies may be secured from the secretary of the conference, Mr. James E. West, 1343 Clifton street, NW., Washington, D. C.

I heartily indorse the declarations of the conference and bespeak your cooperation in getting the same before the people of your State directly interested in the subject-matter thereof.

Inclosed herewith also find a copy of the programme giving the names of those invited to the conference and showing the positions they occupy.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

HON. CHARLES E. HUGHES,
Governor of New York, Albany, New York.

INDEX.

| | Page. |
|---|---------------|
| Addams, Miss Jane, Modern Devices for Minimizing Dependency..... | 99-101 |
| Almshouses..... | 38 |
| Remarks of— | |
| Dr. Charles F. McKenna..... | 162-163 |
| Mrs. Frederic Schoff..... | 163 |
| Atkinson, Hon. George W., address on home finding..... | 121 |
| "A word of greeting from the District of Columbia," Hon H. B. F. Macfarland.. | 84-85 |
| Banquet committee..... | 200 |
| Barrett, Mrs. Kate Waller: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| State inspection..... | 68 |
| Cooperation..... | 183-184 |
| Bernstein, Dr. Ludwig B.: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home finding..... | 129-130 |
| Cottage system..... | 147 |
| Birtwell, Charles W.: | |
| Signer of letter requesting conference..... | 18 |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home finding..... | 133-134 |
| Facts and records..... | 159 |
| Supervision..... | 164 |
| Address on permanent organization..... | 165-166, 177 |
| Remarks on cooperation..... | 187 |
| Brace, Charles Loring, remarks on undesirable legislation..... | 191 |
| Brown, Dr. Elmer E., address on inspection of educational work..... | 152-153 |
| Butler, Amos W.: | |
| Address on— | |
| State inspection..... | 56-58 |
| Undesirable legislation..... | 189 |
| Butler, Edmond J., member committee on resolutions..... | 14 |
| Carroll, Richard, address on home finding..... | 136-138 |
| Clark, A. W.: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home care..... | 48-49 |
| Undesirable legislation..... | 187 |
| Committee on arrangements..... | 19 |
| Report of..... | 37-40 |
| Committee on resolutions..... | 14 |
| Appointment by President..... | 40 |
| Report of..... | 191-199 |
| Conclusions of the Conference | 8-14, 191-199 |
| Cooperation..... | 13 |
| Address of— | |
| Prof. Charles R. Henderson..... | 70-72 |
| Hon. Thomas W. Hynes..... | 73-74 |
| Remarks of— | |
| Hon. William H. De Lacy..... | 74-76 |
| Rev. William J. White, D. D..... | 77 |
| Hon. Charles P. Neill..... | 77-78 |
| Mrs. H. B. F. Macfarland..... | 78-79 |
| Henry W. Thurston..... | 79, 184 |
| Seymour H. Stone..... | 181-182 |
| James F. Jackson..... | 182-183 |
| Mrs. Kate Waller Barrett..... | 183-184 |
| Sumner W. Haynes..... | 184 |

| Cooperation—Continued. | Page. |
|---|--------------|
| Remarks of—Continued. | |
| David F. Tilley..... | 185 |
| William B. Streeter..... | 185 |
| Rev. C. C. Stahmann..... | 185, 186-187 |
| Mrs. Lucy M. Sickels..... | 185-186 |
| Dr. Edward T. Devine..... | 186 |
| Charles W. Birtwell (acting chairman)..... | 187 |
| Cottage system..... | 10-11 |
| Dr. Rudolph R. Reeder..... | 140-143 |
| Galen A. Merrill..... | 143-144 |
| Dr. Ludwig B. Bernstein..... | 147 |
| William B. Streeter..... | 148 |
| George B. Robinson..... | 148-149 |
| Hon. Simon Wolf..... | 149-150 |
| Mrs. Frederic Schoff..... | 150-151 |
| Solomon Lowenstein..... | 151 |
| Crane, Richard, remarks on home finding..... | 126-128 |
| Curtis, Miss Frances Greely: | |
| Remarks on home care..... | 54-55 |
| Query about permanent organization..... | 168 |
| De Lacy, Judge William H.: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home care..... | 55-56 |
| Cooperation..... | 74-76 |
| “Destitute Colored Children of the South,” Dr. Booker T. Washington.... | 113-117 |
| Devine, Dr. Edward T.: | |
| Signer of letter requesting conference..... | 18 |
| Remarks on home care..... | 47-48 |
| Address on home finding..... | 120 |
| Remarks on— | |
| Permanent organization..... | 175 |
| Federal Children’s Bureau..... | 179-180 |
| Query about cooperation..... | 186 |
| Doyle, Michael Francis, remarks on inspection of educational work..... | 155-156 |
| Dreiser, Theodore: | |
| Signer of letter requesting conference..... | 18 |
| Member of banquet committee..... | 200 |
| Dysart, Rev. J. P., remarks on home finding..... | 124-125 |
| Einstein, Mrs. William, remarks on inspection of educational work..... | 157-158 |
| Eissfeldt, Rev. C.: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home finding..... | 123 |
| Facts and records..... | 161 |
| Facts and records..... | 12 |
| Charles W. Birtwell..... | 159 |
| James E. West..... | 159 |
| Rev. Walter Reid Hunt..... | 159-160 |
| Sumner W. Haynes..... | 160-161 |
| Rev. C. Eissfeldt..... | 161 |
| William H. Pear..... | 161-162 |
| Falconer, Mrs. Martha P., remarks on home finding..... | 130 |
| “Family influence,” Right Rev. D. J. McMahon..... | 94-98 |
| Federal Children’s Bureau..... | 14 |
| Owen R. Lovejoy..... | 178 |
| Dr. Edward T. Devine..... | 179-180 |
| Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay..... | 180-181 |
| Miss Lillian D. Wald..... | 201-204 |
| Mornay Williams..... | 205-206 |
| Rev. Francis H. Gavis..... | 207-209 |
| Letter from Hon. James Rudolph Garfield..... | 211 |
| Folks, Hon. Homer: | |
| Member committee on resolutions..... | 14 |
| Signer of letter requesting conference..... | 18 |
| Member committee on arrangements..... | 19 |
| Elected vice-chairman..... | 36 |
| Remarks as chairman at White House..... | 40 |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Folks, Hon. Homer—Continued. | Page. |
| Reply to query about permanent organization..... | 168 |
| Remarks on permanent organization..... | 173 |
| Remarks as toastmaster at banquet..... | 200 |
| Fox, Hugh F.: | |
| Address on state inspection..... | 58-60 |
| Remarks on permanent organization..... | 172 |
| Frankel, Lee K., remarks on permanent organization..... | 175-176 |
| Garfield, Hon. James Rudolph, letter about Federal Children's Bureau..... | 211 |
| Gaviak, Rev. Francis H., address on Federal Children's Bureau..... | 207-209 |
| Glenn, Mrs. John M., address on permanent organization..... | 166-168, 177 |
| Glenn, John M., signer of letter requesting conference..... | 18 |
| Griswold, Miss Josephine M., remarks on home finding..... | 124 |
| Hart, Dr. Hastings H.: | |
| Chairman committee on resolutions..... | 14, 40 |
| Signer of letter requesting conference..... | 18 |
| Remarks on home care..... | 53 |
| "The Evolution of Child Placing"..... | 104-113 |
| Report of committee on resolutions..... | 191-199 |
| Haynes, Sumner W.: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home finding..... | 131-132 |
| Facts and records..... | 160-161 |
| Cooperation..... | 184 |
| Hebberd, Robert W., address on incorporation..... | 61-62 |
| Henderson, Prof. Charles R.: | |
| Address on cooperation and preventive work..... | 70-72 |
| Remarks on inspection of educational work..... | 154-155 |
| Herrick, Hon. Myron T., remarks on state inspection..... | 65-66 |
| Hirsch, Rabbi Emil G.: | |
| Remarks on state inspection..... | 70 |
| "The Home versus the Institution"..... | 85-94 |
| Home care..... | 9-10 |
| Address by— | |
| Michael J. Scanlon..... | 41-43 |
| James F. Jackson..... | 43-45 |
| Remarks by— | |
| W. B. Sherrard..... | 45 |
| Mornay Williams..... | 46-47 |
| Dr. Edward T. Devine..... | 47-48 |
| A. W. Clark..... | 48-49 |
| Max Mitchell..... | 49-50 |
| Dr. William P. Spratling..... | 50-51 |
| Judge Julian W. Mack..... | 51-52 |
| Rev. William McMahon..... | 52-53 |
| George L. Schon..... | 53 |
| Dr. Hastings H. Hart..... | 53 |
| Martin A. Marks..... | 54 |
| Miss Frances Greely Curtis..... | 54-55 |
| Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay..... | 55 |
| Hon. William H. De Lacy..... | 55-56 |
| Address of— | |
| Right Rev. D. J. McMahon..... | 94-98 |
| Miss Jane Addams..... | 99-101 |
| Home finding..... | 10 |
| Address by— | |
| Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch, D. D., LL. D., Ph. D..... | 85-94 |
| David F. Tilley..... | 101-103 |
| Hastings H. Hart, LL. D..... | 104-113 |
| Remarks by— | |
| A. T. Jamison..... | 118-119 |
| Dr. Edward T. Devine..... | 120 |
| W. B. Sherrard..... | 120 |
| Hon. George W. Atkinson..... | 121 |
| Dr. R. R. Reeder..... | 122 |
| Rev. C. Eissfeldt..... | 123 |
| Miss Josephine M. Griswold..... | 124 |

| Home finding—Continued. | Page. |
|---|------------|
| Remarks by—Continued | |
| Rev. J. P. Dyser | 124-125 |
| B. Pickman Mann | 125-126 |
| Richard Crane | 126-128 |
| Ludwig B. Bernstein | 129-130 |
| Mrs. Martha P. Falconer | 130 |
| Rev. C. C. Stahmann | 131 |
| Sumner W. Haynes | 131-132 |
| Edwin D. Solenberger | 132-133 |
| Charles W. Birtwell | 133-134 |
| James E. West | 134-136 |
| Frank D. Loomis | 138-139 |
| Address of Richard Carroll | 136-138 |
| Memorandum submitted by Adolph Lewisohn | 145-146 |
| Hunt, Rev. Walter Reid, remarks on facts and records | 159-160 |
| Hurley, Timothy D., address on incorporation | 62-65 |
| Hynes, Hon. Thomas W., address on cooperation | 73-74 |
| Institutional care in New York City | 209-211 |
| Invitations sent by President for the conference | 15 |
| Incorporation | 11 |
| Address by— | |
| Robert W. Hebbard | 61-62 |
| Timothy D. Hurley | 62-65 |
| Inspection of educational work | 12 |
| Dr. Elmer E. Brown | 152-153 |
| William B. Streeter | 153-154 |
| Prof. Charles R. Henderson | 154-155 |
| Michael Francis Doyle | 155-156 |
| Mrs. William Einstein | 157-158 |
| B. Pickman Mann | 157 |
| Henry W. Thurston | 158 |
| Jackson, James F.: | |
| Address on home care | 43-45 |
| Remarks on cooperation | 182-183 |
| Jamison, A. T., address on home finding | 118-119 |
| Legislation for the District of Columbia | 7-8 |
| Letter from President to James E. West about permanent organization | 224 |
| Letter to governors | 224 |
| Letter to President requesting the conference | 17-18 |
| Lewisohn, Adolph, remarks on home finding | 145-146 |
| Lindsay, Dr. Samuel McCune: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home care | 55 |
| Federal Children's Bureau | 180-181 |
| Lindsey, Judge Ben. B., address on significance of the conference | 215-221 |
| Loomis, Frank D.: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| State inspection | 69-70 |
| Home finding | 138-139 |
| Lovejoy, Owen R., address on Federal Children's Bureau | 178 |
| Lowenstein, Solomon, remarks on cottage system | 151 |
| McKenna, Dr. Charles F.: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| Undesirable legislation | 66-67, 188 |
| Almshouses | 162-163 |
| McMahon, Right Rev. D. J., "Family influence" | 94-98 |
| McMahon, Rev. William, remarks on home care | 52-53 |
| Macfarland, Mrs. H. B. F., remarks on cooperation | 78-79 |
| Macfarland, Hon. H. B. F.: | |
| Remarks at White House | 55 |
| "A word of greeting from the District of Columbia" | 84-85 |
| Address of welcome to District Building | 118 |
| Mack, Judge Julian W.: | |
| Member committee on resolutions | 14 |
| Signer of letter requesting conference | 18 |
| Elected vice-chairman | 36 |
| Remarks on home care | 51-52 |
| Address on significance of the conference | 221-223 |

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Mann, B. Pickman: | |
| Remarks on— | Page. |
| Home finding..... | 125-126 |
| Inspection of educational work..... | 157 |
| Permanent organization..... | 171 |
| Undesirable legislation..... | 187-188 |
| Marks, Martin A., remarks on home care..... | 54 |
| Merrill, Galen A., address on cottage system..... | 143-144 |
| Metz, Hon. Herman A., institutional care in New York City, preventive work and the significance of the conference..... | 209-211 |
| Mitchell, Max: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home care..... | 49-50 |
| Permanent organization..... | 190 |
| "Modern devices for minimizing dependency," Miss Jane Addams..... | 99-101 |
| Montgomery, John Barrett, remarks on state inspection..... | 67 |
| Mulry, Hon. Thomas M.: | |
| Signer of letter requesting conference..... | 18 |
| Member committee on arrangements..... | 19 |
| Elected vice-chairman..... | 36 |
| Remarks as chairman at public session..... | 83-84 |
| Neill, Hon. Charles P., remarks on cooperation..... | 77-78 |
| Officers and committees..... | 32 |
| Election of officers..... | 36 |
| Appointment of committees..... | 19, 40 |
| Pear, William H., remarks on facts and records..... | 161-162 |
| Permanent organization..... | 13-14 |
| Charles W. Birtwell..... | 165-166, 177 |
| Mrs. John M. Glenn..... | 166-168, 177 |
| Miss Frances Greely Curtis..... | 168 |
| Homer Folks (chairman)..... | 168, 173 |
| James E. West..... | 168-169, 174 |
| Mrs. Frank S. Streeter..... | 170 |
| Mrs. Frederic Schoff..... | 170 |
| George B. Robinson, of Norfolk..... | 170-171 |
| Miss Lillian D. Wald..... | 171 |
| B. Pickman Mann..... | 171 |
| Mornay Williams..... | 172 |
| Hugh F. Fox..... | 172 |
| Henry W. Thurston..... | 172-173 |
| Dr. Edward T. Devine..... | 175 |
| Lee K. Frankel..... | 175-176 |
| Max Mitchell..... | 190 |
| Action taken by President..... | 224 |
| Persons who were invited to the conference..... | 20-31 |
| Physical care, address by Dr. Newton M. Shaffer..... | 12-13, 80-82 |
| "Preservation of the family home," David F. Tilley..... | 101-103 |
| President's message to Congress..... | 5-8 |
| Preventive work..... | 10 |
| Remarks by George W. Wilder..... | 79-80 |
| Address by Miss Jane Addams..... | 99-101 |
| Remarks by— | |
| Dr. Edward T. Devine..... | 47-48 |
| Prof. Charles R. Henderson..... | 70-72 |
| Address by— | |
| Judge Ben B. Lindsey..... | 215-221 |
| Judge Julian W. Mack..... | 221-223 |
| Hon. Herman A. Metz..... | 209-211 |
| Programme of conference..... | 37-39 |
| Programme for public session..... | 83 |
| Propositions suggested for consideration in memorandum accompanying President's letter..... | 16, 37-38 |
| Propositions, additional, suggested by committee on arrangements..... | 88 |
| Reception committee (for public session)..... | 83 |
| Reeder, Dr. R. R.: | |
| Remarks on home finding..... | 122 |
| Address on cottage system..... | 140-143 |

| Report of: | Page. |
|--|--------------|
| Committee on resolutions..... | 191-199 |
| Committee on arrangements..... | 38-40 |
| Conference to President..... | 212 |
| Request for President to call conference..... | 17-18 |
| Resolutions suggested by W. B. Sherrard..... | 164 |
| Robinson, George B., remarks on cottage system..... | 148-149 |
| Roosevelt, President Theodore: | |
| Message to Congress..... | 5-8 |
| Invitation for the conference..... | 15 |
| Address at White House..... | 35-37 |
| Address at banquet..... | 212-215 |
| Action taken in matter of permanent organization..... | 224 |
| Letter sent to governors..... | 224 |
| Robinson, George B., of Norfolk, Va., remarks on permanent organization... | 170-171 |
| Ruesing, Very Rev. Joseph, remarks on undesirable legislation..... | 190 |
| Rules of conference..... | 39 |
| Scanlan, Michael J., address on home care..... | 41-43 |
| Schoff, Mrs. Frederic: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| State inspection..... | 69 |
| Cottage system..... | 150-151 |
| Almahouses..... | 163 |
| Permanent organization..... | 170 |
| Sehon, George L., remarks on home care..... | 53 |
| Sleman, John B., jr., treasurer, banquet committee..... | 200 |
| Shaffer, Newton M., M. D., address on care of crippled children..... | 80-82 |
| Sherrard, W. B.: | |
| Remarks on home care..... | 45 |
| Address on home finding..... | 120 |
| Resolutions suggested..... | 164 |
| Remarks on undesirable legislation..... | 188-189 |
| Sickels, Mrs. Lucy M., remarks on cooperation..... | 185-186 |
| Significance of the conference: | |
| Judge Ben. B. Lindsey..... | 215-221 |
| Judge Julian W. Mack..... | 221-223 |
| Hon. Herman A. Metz..... | 209-211 |
| Slingerland, Rev. W. H., remarks on undesirable legislation..... | 190 |
| Solenberger, Edwin D., address on home finding..... | 132-133 |
| Spratling, Dr. William P., remarks on home care..... | 50-51 |
| Stahmann, Rev. C. C.: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| State inspection..... | 68-69 |
| Home finding..... | 131 |
| Cooperation..... | 185, 186-187 |
| State inspection..... | 11 |
| Address by— | |
| Amos W. Butler..... | 56-58 |
| Hugh F. Fox..... | 58-60 |
| Remarks of— | |
| Hon. Myron T. Herrick..... | 65-66 |
| John Barrett Montgomery..... | 67 |
| Mrs. Kate Waller Barrett..... | 68 |
| Rev. C. C. Stahmann..... | 68-69 |
| Mrs. Frederic Schoff..... | 69 |
| Frank D. Loomis..... | 69-70 |
| Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch..... | 70 |
| Stone, Seymour H., remarks on cooperation..... | 181-182 |
| Streeter, Mrs. Frank S., remarks on permanent organization..... | 170 |
| Streeter, William B.: | |
| Remarks on cottage system..... | 148 |
| Address on inspection of educational work..... | 153-154 |
| Remarks on cooperation..... | 185 |
| Syllabi of conference resolutions..... | 8-9 |
| Summary of resolutions..... | 14 |
| “The evolution of child placing,” Dr. Hastings H. Hart..... | 104-113 |
| “The Home versus the Institution,” Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch..... | 85-94 |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Thurston, Henry W.: | Page. |
| Remarks on— | |
| Cooperation..... | 79, 184 |
| Inspection of educational work..... | 158 |
| Permanent organization..... | 172, 173 |
| Tilley, David F.: | |
| "Preservation of the Family Home"..... | 101-103 |
| Remarks on cooperation..... | 185 |
| Undesirable legislation..... | 13 |
| Remarks of— | |
| Dr. Charles F. McKenna..... | 66-67, 188 |
| A. W. Clark..... | 187 |
| B. Pickman Mann..... | 187-188 |
| W. B. Sherrard..... | 188-189 |
| Amos W. Butler..... | 189 |
| Very Rev. Joseph Ruesing..... | 190 |
| Rev. W. H. Slingerland..... | 190 |
| Charles Loring Brace..... | 191 |
| Wald, Miss Lillian D.: | |
| Remarks on permanent organization..... | 171 |
| Address on Federal children's bureau..... | 201-204 |
| Washington, Dr. Booker T., address on "Destitute colored children of the South"..... | 113-117 |
| West, James E.: | |
| Member committee on resolutions..... | 14 |
| Signer of letter requesting conference..... | 18 |
| Chairman committee on arrangements..... | 19 |
| Elected as secretary..... | 36 |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home finding..... | 134-136 |
| Facts and records..... | 159 |
| Permanent organization..... | 168-169, 174 |
| Wilson, George W., chairman banquet committee..... | 200 |
| White, Rev. William J., D. D., remarks on cooperation..... | 77 |
| Wilder, George W., remarks on preventive work..... | 79-80 |
| Williams, Mornay: | |
| Remarks on— | |
| Home care..... | 46-47 |
| Permanent organization..... | 172 |
| Address on Federal Children's Bureau..... | 205-206 |
| Wolf, Hon. Simon, remarks on cottage system..... | 149-150 |



2001
BOOK REPAIR
UNIV OF MICHIGAN

